THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF MARK

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
VERNON K. ROBBINS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
AUGUST, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I. THE CHARACTER OF THE MARCAN PRESENTATION 1

Introduction 1
The Gospel of Mark as Proclamation of History 6
The Unification of the Gospel of Mark through Myth . . 18
The Gospel of Mark as Narration of Kerygma 24

Kerygma and Christological Formulations
Kerygma and the Structure of the Marcan Narrative

Setting the Problem for Investigating the Marcan Christology 51

II. CHRISTOLOGY AND NARRATIVE STRUCTURE IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK 56

Introduction 56
Mark 1:14-15 and 3:7-12 60

Mark 1:14-15
Mark 3:7-12
The Authoritative Son of God

Mark 6:1-6 and 8:27-33 103

Mark 6:1-6
The Rejected Prophet-Healer
Mark 8:27-33
The Rejected-Rising Son of Man

Mark 10:46-52 and 13:1-37 132

Mark 10:46-52
The Son of David
Mark 13:1-37
The Son of Man-Son of God

Conclusion 149

III. THE CHRISTOLOGICAL UNITY OF MARK 151

The Correlation of Authority and Humiliation in Mark . 151
Marcan Christology and Rome 166

BIBLIOGRAPHY 175

CHAPTER I

THE CHARACTER OF THE MARCAN PRESENTATION

Introduction

During the past two decades a special interest has arisen within New Testament scholarship which focuses upon those Christian believers who proclaimed their faith through a form of narrative rather than an epistolary form. This has led to a lively discussion of the individual synoptic Gospels and an analysis of them through a methodology called redaction criticism.[1] In contrast with form criticism, which centered its investigation upon the interpretation of each individual paragraph within the Gospels,[2] redaction criticism has focused upon the selection, arrangement, and composition of material for the formation of the Gospel narrative.[3]

---

[1] For a comprehensive discussion of this method and the state of its results see Joachim Rohde, Die redaktionsgeschichtliche Methode: Einführung und Sichtung des Forschungstandes (Hamburg: Furche, 1966).

[2] The two pioneer form-critical investigations of the synoptic Gospels are found in Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, trans. by Bertram L. Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.) and Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. by John Marsh (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).

[3] The first extensive applications of this methodology appeared in Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz J. Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, trans. by Percy Scott, The New Testament Library (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), and Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960). The name Redaktionsgeschichte was given to the methodology in Willi Marxsen, Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Heft 49 [New Series], Heft 67 [Entire Set] (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959).

Within this redactional work of the Evangelist,[1] scholars seek the purpose which motivated him in his writing. Because this purpose revolves around the proclamation of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection as affecting in some way man's relationship to God, this purpose is called the theological view of the writer. Hence a current interest in the study of the Gospels is to uncover and present the theology of a Gospel.

The task of writing a theology of the Gospel of Mark brings forth a few special problems. First of all, the redactional activity in Mark is difficult to ascertain because there is no pre-Marcan source which can be consulted in the investigation of the Marcan narrative. With Matthew and Luke the situation is different since they both used Mark extensively as they wrote and a comparison of their narrative with Mark is often very instructuve for Matthean or Lucan redactional activity. Consequently, various kinds of approaches have been used to discover the Marcan Evangelist's redactional activity, and the emphases within these approaches are often quite different.[2] Secondly, the Marcan Evangelist most likely

---

[1] In this dissertation "Evangelist" refers to a person who wrote a Gospel; "Mark" refers to the literary document itself, as does "Matthew" or "Luke."

[2] Johannes Schreiber, "Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LVIII (1961), 154-55, formulated four rules for the redactional analysis of Mark. They are translated as follows in James M. Robinson, "The Problem of History in Mark, Reconsidered," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, XX (1965), 134:

> "1. All verses of Mark that are to be ascribed to Mark's redaction on the basis of the methods of analytical research provide the point of departure for establishing his theology, to the extent that a unified theological conception becomes visible in spite of the fact that these verses are scattered over the whole gospel.
>
> "2. Where Matthew or Luke or indeed both alter the text of Mark at a given point, especially if this is carried through the whole gospel, we very probably have to do with a theological Marcan statement which

created the Gospel form. Prior to his writing, the longest narrative was probably the passion story,[1] and, in addition, some collections of stories were available for his use.[2] Therefore, part of the challenge of interpreting Mark is to explain why he chose a form of narrative as the medium for his presentation, and, furthermore, why he created a narrative with the exact scope his Gospel has. Thirdly, the Marcan Evangelist often chose to present his view by his arrangement of traditional material rather than by an extensive rewriting of that material. Thus it is likely that he at times selected material for one purpose which included certain features which were not dominant motifs for him, but he did not exclude those features because they were part

---

> they reject. This principle is valid especially where it can be shown that their own theology contradicts that of Mark on this point.
>
> "3. The selection and arrangement of the tradition in Mark also permits inferences as to the evangelist's redaction.
>
> "4. The Marcan theology as established on the basis of these principles must not only produce a message consistent in itself, but it must also be meaningful in terms of a given situation in the history of religion."

Eduard Schweizer has emphasized the analysis of Marcan vocabulary for understanding the Marcan theology in "Anmerkungen zur Theologie des Markus," *Neotestamentica et Patristica*. *Freundesgabe für O. Cullmann*, ed. by W. C. van Unnik (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), pp. 35-46. He then fused this analysis with an analysis of the structure of the narrative and arrived at the conclusions discussed in "Die Theologische Leistung des Markus," *Evangelische Theologie*, XXIV (1964), 337-55 and "Mark's Contribution to the Quest of the Historical Jesus," *New Testament Studies*, X (1964), 421-32.

Willi Marxsen, on the other hand, has emphasized arrangement and addition as significant redactional activities of the Evangelist, *Markus*, esp. pp. 17-32, 77-101.

[1] Dibelius, *Tradition*, p. 23.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 219.

of that tradition. This dimension of his work makes it extremely difficult at times to decide what has been the predominant motivation behind the selection of some of his material. These three aspects of the Gospel of Mark make the understanding and interpretation of it a complex matter. Because of this challenge there has been extensive discussion of that Gospel, but because of the complexities in interpreting it there is a lack of agreement among scholars with respect to the overall theological intention of the Evangelist who produced it.

While there is great difficulty in interpreting the Gospel of Mark, however, there is no reason to forsake the task of defining the theological intention of the Evangelist which furnishes the unity to the overall narrative. The research on the synoptic Gospels in recent decades has indicated that the work of W. Wrede and J. Wellhausen was a proper turning point in the investigation of the Gospel of Mark. These men had demonstrated that the Marcan narrative was motivated by the beliefs of the community rather than historical reporting. Through the researches of form criticism the beliefs of the community have been analyzed and discussed from the viewpoint of the historical development of these kerygmatic traditions, and now the task of interpreting the Gospel of Mark consists of correlating the impulses within these kerygmatic traditions with the narrative form of the Gospel presentation. One type of impulse within these traditions is the application to Jesus of certain Christological formulas.[1] These Christological formulations center around characterizations of Jesus as Messiah, Son of man, Son of God,

---

[1] That is, they focus upon the religious meaning of Jesus Christ in their treatment of the relationship of man to God.

Son of David, Servant, Prophet, and Lord. These formulations derive from stages of tradition prior to the production of detailed Christological doctrines by Christian writers from the second to the fifth century. In our investigation one of the main questions is the degree to which the creation of the Gospel form was also an important step toward the developed Christology of the Christian communities. The preliminary indications are that the Christological statements made at the time of the formation of the kerygma into Gospel narratives were crucial influences in the later development of Christian doctrine. Of great interest, then, is the relationship of the Marcan Christological statements to the pre-Marcan affirmations; in other words, the degree to which the Marcan Evangelist redirected previous Christological traditions or formulated new Christological affirmations.

The road to the study of the Christology of Mark is difficult, because, as noted above, the discussions of the entire Gospel present varied opinions as to its place and meaning in the early Church. Therefore, one must first proceed discriminatingly through the investigations of the Gospel, then approach the question of the Christological affirmations of the Gospel in the context of these prior investigations. With this purpose in mind, we will first treat the three main issues which have arisen in the investigations of the Marcan Gospel: (a) the type of history within the Gospel; (b) the place of myth within the Gospel; (c) the relationship of kerygma and the Gospel narrative. Within recent decades these issues have dominated the discussions of the Gospel, and at the same time they set the stage for our Christological investigation.

The Gospel of Mark as Proclamation of History

In his study, The Problem of History in Mark,[1] which was completed in 1955 to fulfill a doctorate degree at Princeton and first published in 1956,[2] James M. Robinson became convinced that the major inadequacy in the interpretations of Mark lay in improper understandings of the character of the history contained in that Gospel. Robinson had discovered that, prior to the work of Wrede, Mark had been viewed as the Gospel which contained the highest degree of historical objectivity. After the work of Wrede and Wellhausen, in which the insight into the way in which the Evangelist presented Jesus as the Christ altered the estimation of the Evangelist's historical objectivity, a great number of studies on Mark were published which wandered from one base of interpretation to another without determining the controlling factor in the Evangelist's intention. They proposed that the Gospel contains an "astral or Babylonian mythological" point of view, an allegorical view of names and actions, Pauline doctrinal motifs, or cycles and number symbolisms.[3] In each instance these studies had not treated seriously enough, in Robinson's opinion, the fact that the Evangelist had presented his Gospel in a chronological and geographical framework. It was to Julius Schniewind's credit, in Robinson's view, that he saw that the intention of the Evangelist was to "historicize" the oral tradition,[4] and K. L. Schmidt properly went beyond Schniewind to declare that "the early Church had a vital concern for the redemptive history of Jesus."[1] Hans Jürgen Ebeling had for the first time in Marcan interpretation attempted to do justice to the type of religious understanding in the Evangelist's Church which brought him to present his statement about Christian faith through a history of Jesus. But Ebeling had addressed himself primarily to the question of the messianic secret in Mark, and to this end had not dealt with the entire Gospel in a way that was necessary if one was to understand the overall purpose of that Gospel.[2] Robinson's purpose, in the light of this previous work, was to correlate these three insights into the Marcan narrative: (a) the intention of the Evangelist to "historicize" the oral tradition; (b) the early Church's vital concern for the redemptive history of Jesus; and (c) the type of religious understanding present in the Evangelist's Church which brought him to present his statement about Christian faith through a history of Jesus. Robinson's purpose, then, was to define the Evangelist's understanding of history, and it is this particular type of religious understanding which would furnish a center of interpretation which would do justice to the Evangelist's history of Jesus and the Evangelist's religious experience.[3]

---

[1] James M. Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 21 (2d ed.; London: S. C. M. Press, 1962).

[2] See Robinson's own account of the origin and completion of this book in Robinson, "Mark, Reconsidered," pp. 144-45.

[3] Robinson, Problem, pp. 9-12. [4] Ibid., p. 13.

For Robinson, a key place for ascertaining the Evangelist's understanding of history is his introduction, Mark 1:1-13. The Evangelist begins his Gospel by locating a "beginning" (Mark 1:1).[4] Robinson interprets this "beginning" as "a technical term employed by the early Church for defining the kerygma (Luke 23:5; Acts 10:37) and apostleship (Luke 1:2; Acts 1:22: John 15:27). It was adopted by all the Evangelists in their presentations (Matt. 4:17; Luke 3:22; 4:21; Acts 1:1; John 1:1; 2:11)."[1] Then Robinson notices that the "beginning of the Gospel" is announced in vs. 1 but the preaching of the Gospel is not mentioned until 1:14-15. Thus, he asserts, for the Evangelist, the good news begins before a strict proclamation; the good news is basically occurrence in which something happens, and for this reason it can begin to happen before it is proclaimed. Therefore a person must do justice to the Evangelist's understanding of the Gospel in the fact that the Gospel is the account of an occurrence of something which happened in history. But there is immediately another element within the Gospel of Mark: cosmic language which comes into this historical presentation and characterizes this history as God's history. There is a formal contrast between the history in 1:4-8 surrounding John the Baptist and the history in 1:9-13 in which Jesus is introduced into the narrative. In vss. 4-8 the world is a regular world into which John the Baptist comes and announces to the Jews the necessity for repentance; in vss. 9-13 the heavens split open and a voice comes down to Jesus and cosmic powers such as Satan and angels appear. During this latter scene all humans disappear and, although Jesus is present in the human historical context in which John the Baptist and his followers live, he is also at work in the cosmic context of God versus Satan.[2] After this cosmic occurrence, the Evangelist begins Jesus' ministry in 1:14-15 indicating that something has happened--the times have shifted, the kingdom is now near--and we are to look into the subsequent narrative in the Gospel of Mark to discover the occurrence of this fulfillment in the ministry of Jesus. The cosmic dimension of Jesus' historical ministry is most clearly portrayed in the exorcisms which he performs, and this cosmic struggle on the historical plane of life is ended as Jesus and God overcome the demons and Satan in the crucifixion and the resurrection. In this way the Evangelist presents an understanding of history in which the narrative line has as its context a cosmic struggle between God and Satan.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 14. [2] Ibid., pp. 14-15. [3] Ibid., p. 15. [4] Ibid., p. 21.

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid., p. 27.

Robinson went a step further in his interpretation of the type of history within Mark: he asserted that the Evangelist had reflected upon the historical aspect of his presentation in such a way that he presented that history in a formally periodized manner. The formal contrast between the Baptist and Jesus in the introduction includes within it a distinction between the time of the prophets and the time of Jesus.[1] The rest of the narrative, and especially chapter 13, reveals that the Evangelist also thought in terms of a time of the Church.[2] Thus in the Gospel of Mark there is a formal periodizing of history to a time of the prophets, a time of Jesus, and a time of the Church. In the first period fulfillment is initiated at the end of the Baptist's ministry; the second and third periods contain the battle between the Spirit and Satan--the second period ends with Christ's victory in the cross and resurrection, the third period represents the time of the Church in which Spirit and Satan are still in battle.[3]

Robinson's investigation truly set the stage for the current discussion of the type of history which is to be found in Mark. The strength of his work lies in his attempt to take the entire scope of the Marcan narrative into consideration. The weakness of it, as Robinson himself has explained, is mostly methodological: "the method of Redaktionsgeschichte . . . was not caried over into [this] Marcan research . . ."[1] Most unsatisfactory was a failure to differentiate sharply enough between tradition and redaction. If that distinction is made, then especially his interpretation of the exorcisms is altered, and further, the cosmic struggle which he depicts must be somewhat differently envisioned within the Gospel narrative.[2]

---

[1] _Ibid._, pp. 22-23. [2] _Ibid._, pp. 54-67. [3] _Ibid._, p. 59.

T. A. Burkill has also exhibited a great interest in the type of history which is to be found in the Gospel of Mark. Before developing his view, he emphasizes that the Gospel is made up of conflicting and competing themes which prevent it from being a unified presentation. "Mark was perhaps the first writer who attempted to supply a comprehensive account of the career of Jesus in terms of the apostolic faith." Thus "conflicting motives evidently compete for dominance in his mind as he writes, and this considerably weakens the formative power of his thought to weld the multifarious materials he uses so as to present a wholly consistent pattern of ideas."[3] Within this not totally unified account, however, the narrative is integrated by a theology of salvation which participates in a broad historical schema.[1] This theology of salvation is not new with Mark but had arisen within the Church as it tried to solve the problem which had been set for early Christians by the circumstance that Jesus, whom they proclaimed to be the Messiah, had not been received as the promised Messiah but had been rejected and crucified. This problem is especially evident in the writing of Paul. In I Cor. 1:23 Paul expressed the difficulty that "the doctrine of the crucified Messiah was a stumbling-block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles."[2] The Church had attempted to answer this problem with the view that God had foreordained that the Messiah be rejected and crucified. Thus it was argued that Jesus was "delivered up according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God" (Acts 2:23; cf. Luke 24:25-26) and that Christ died in accordance with the scriptures (I Cor. 15:3).[3] Paul addressed this same problem in Rom. 9-11 and suggested that it was God's will to dull the faculties of the Jewish people to bring about this divine act.[4] The Marcan Evangelist "takes the view that the public are prevented from knowing of the kingdom through the cryptology of parabolic teaching (Mk 4:11f.) and through the injunctions to silence (Mk 3:12), . . ." and suggests that it was part of God's will that even the disciples would not apprehend the saving truth of the Messiahship of Jesus for a brief duration of time.[5] He shows this sovereign purpose of God throughout the narrative by portraying: (a) the way in which Jesus' life, death, and resurrection fulfilled scripture, and (b) the way in which Jesus had foreknowledge of his fate--his fate was predetermined by God.[1]

---

[1] Robinson, "Mark, Reconsidered," p. 133.

[2] See below, Ernest Best's modification of Robinson's work in The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, No. 2 (Cambridge University Press, 1965) and Heinz-Dieter Knigge, "The Meaning of Mark. The Exegesis of the Second Gospel," Interpretation, XXII (1968), 54-56, 62-63.

[3] T. A. Burkill, "The Hidden Son of Man in St. Mark's Gospel," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LII (1961), 190.

---

[1] Ibid., and T. A. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation: An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1963), p. 323.

[2] Burkill, "Hidden Son," p. 191. [3] Ibid., pp. 190-91.

[4] Ibid., pp. 193-94. [5] Ibid.

Burkill suggests further that the Evangelist not only built upon these two motifs for depicting the predeterminate nature of Jesus' life and death, but in the Evangelist's presentation of God's plan of salvation he "seems to distinguish four principal stages or periods."[2] The Evangelist has not developed the doctrinal significance of each of these periods, nor worked out the manner of their interconnection, but his presentation is such that one can say that he thought in terms of these four divisions in history:

> the period of preparation, which comes to an end with the imprisonment of the appointed forerunner; the period of the incarnate life, which is characterized by suffering and obscurity; the post resurrection period of enlightenment, in which the gospel of the crucified Messiah is publicly proclaimed by the Church; the period of eschatological fulfillment, which will be gloriously inaugurated by the Son of man at his awaited parousia.[3]

In this latter statement of the periodization of history within Mark, there exists a striking parallel between Burkill and Robinson. The most significant difference is that Robinson indicated that the period of eschatological fulfillment began with the inauguration of Jesus' ministry. For this reason the ministry of Jesus in Mark takes place in an eschatological type of history and the time of the Church is, in an important way, the continuation of the same kind of history that was at work in Jesus' ministry.[4] For Burkill, the inauguration of the period of eschatological fulfillment will begin only with the coming of the Son of man in the future. The introduction to Mark is not, for Burkill, so important for indicating the time of fulfillment which begins in Jesus' ministry; rather it begins with a citation of biblical prophecy which participates fully in the Evangelist's view of the predetermined nature of Jesus' life and death.[1] Further, Burkill does not emphasize an existential interconnection between the time of Jesus and the time of the Church on the basis of the same eschatological history in which they participate. Rather, Peter's confession, for instance, "is of importance in the evangelist's scheme because it can serve as a basis for further instruction which, besides preparing the reader for what he takes to be a right understanding of the passion-narrative as a delineation of the mysterious meaning of the Messiahship in its historical realization, enables the disciples to receive the saving truth of the gospel from the Son of Man himself."[2] The disciples "can retain it as authentic tradition and can thus equip themselves for their future role as apostles and pillars of the expanding church."[3] Hence, for Burkill, of prime importance is the mode of mysterious revelation which works within the theology of salvation. This mysterious revelation gives the teaching, which was misunderstood in the time of Jesus, the status of authentic tradition in the post-resurrection period of enlightenment and characterizes the historical activity in the time of the ministry of Jesus as a time when God was mysteriously working out his plan of salvation for men.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 191. [2] Burkill, Mysterious, p. 320.

[3] Ibid. [4] Robinson, Problem, p. 59.

Georg Strecker, also, has emphasized that the Gospel of Mark represents a historicization of the Gospel tradition. He has undertaken the task of demonstrating this in the redactional work of the Evangelist, first attempting to show how the historicization is worked out in the Evangelist's conception of the messianic secret[1] and, secondly, in the passion predictions in 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-34.[2]

---

[1] Burkill, "Hidden Son," p. 192. [2] _Ibid_., p. 193. [3] _Ibid_.

In his article on the messianic secret in the Gospel of Mark, Strecker attempted primarily to demonstrate that the theory of the messianic secret in Mark is carefully worked out by the Evangelist in a temporal scheme. In the Gospel the Evangelist portrays an excellent self consciousness, shared with his community, which distinguished between the life of Jesus, in which Jesus' messiahship was reservedly proclaimed, and the time after the resurrection, when all understood and proclaimed his Lordship.[3] Accepting Wrede's emphasis upon Mark 9:9 ("he charged them to tell no one what they had seen until the Son of man should have risen from the dead") as central for the understanding of the theory of the messianic secret in Mark, Strecker attempts to demonstrate that this time scheme is evident in the redactional work of the entire framework of the Gospel. Thus, in contrast to Wrede who emphasized that this verse was designed to explain why people during Jesus' life did not proclaim Jesus as Messiah, Strecker emphasizes that this time scheme presents the way in which the Marcan Evangelist's community can look back upon the life of Jesus as a "valid" ministry but a ministry in the past which ended in the resurrection. The resurrection opened up a new period in salvation history when the Church proclaims Jesus' timeless significance for salvation yet relates its message back to the salvation events which took place in Jesus' life. Thus, for Strecker, the Evangelist intentionally historicizes the kerygmatic tradition; it is "message as report."[1]

---

[1] Georg Strecker, "Zur Messiasgeheimnistheorie im Markusevangelium," Studia Evangelica, Vol. III, ed. by F. L. Cross, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literature, Bd. 88 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964), pp. 87-104.

[2] Georg Strecker, "Die Leidens und Auferstehungsvoraussagen im Markusevangelium (Mk. 8,31; 9,31; 10,32-34)," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LXIV (1967), 16-39.

[3] Strecker, "Zur Messiasgeheimnistheorie," pp. 103-04.

In the later article Strecker developed in detail an assertion that he made in his earlier article--that the passion predictions give clear evidence of the Evangelist's temporal and spatial scheme which extends from the Baptist to the resurrection and from Galilee to Northern Galilee toward Jerusalem and, finally, into Jerusalem. In these predictions the theory of the messianic secrecy, the misunderstanding of the disciples, and the fact of the death of Jesus which leads to his resurrection are redactionally correlated within this temporal and spatial scheme. The Evangelist has developed this scheme in a threefold manner composing each later prediction out of Mark 8:31 and in relation to the passion narrative tradition. Thus, these three passion predictions bring the temporal and spatial views of the Evangelist into line with the view of the messianic secret, the disciples' misunderstanding, and the Church's proclamation of the exalted Lord.

Strecker's view of the distinction between the time of Jesus and the time after the resurrection has much in common with Burkill's historical periodization of Mark. His uniqueness lies in his attempt to display a correlation of this temporal scheme with a geographical scheme which is worked out in the Evangelist's view of the messianic secret, the misunderstanding of the disciples, and the theologia crucis. But, it is very doubtful that the Marcan Evangelist has consciously periodized history in this way. A systematic categorization of time and space within a history of salvation such as Robinson, Burkill, and Strecker suggest is really appropriate only in a discussion of Luke-Acts.[1] Hans Conzelmann has demonstrated the way in which Luke-Acts exemplifies the proclamation which results from a conscious periodization of history within God's plan of salvation,[2] and the Marcan production must be carefully distinguished from that later production. In contrast, Conzelmann has suggested, the Marcan Gospel proclaims salvation in the "between time" without having yet worked out a scheme of historical periodization. The Evangelist does not develop a historical scheme with regard to the death, resurrection, and parousia--the death and resurrection statements are never connected with the parousia statements and vice versa.[3] In Mark the essential step taken is that of reworking the problem of the parousia.[4] In light of the absence of the Lord, the Evangelist connects the Christological statements about the past with the Christological statements about the future.[5] In chapter 13 the Evangelist has intentionally created a continuity between the present time and the past and the future through the concept of the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 104.

---

[1] Cf. Knigge, "Meaning," p. 64.

[2] Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960).

[3] Hans Conzelmann, "Geschichte und Eschaton nach Mc 13," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, L (1959), 210.

[4] Ibid., p. 211.

[5] See esp. 8:31-9:1 and that which follows in 9:2-8 and 9:9-13.

Son of man who suffered, died, arose, and will come in the future. For the Evangelist the present historical continuity was essentially a Christological continuity rather than a temporal continuity within a plan of God's salvation. The Evangelist addressed himself to a community which was caught in the "between time" between resurrection and the awaited parousia when the exalted Lord was not present and the community was caught in sufferings with neither the historical Jesus nor the future Son of man to turn to. He attempted to reassure his community that it stood in an eschatological process which would soon come to completion and to convince them that the exalted Lord, though absent from them then, would come in the future. Thus the Evangelist wished for his community to regain a sense of an eschatological and Christological continuity between its own time and the past and the future. This concern of the Evangelist led him to present his Gospel in a narrative of Jesus' earthly life, but to minimize historical epochs and emphasize two kinds of parallel situations: (a) the parallels between the disciple during the life of Jesus and the present believer in the Church, and (b) the parallels between the life of Jesus and the life of the present believer in the Church. This intention is perhaps most evident in the Evangelist's modification of the apocalyptic discourse as he constructed chapter 13. In chapter 13 the Evangelist breaks up the time scheme of the apocalyptic material and interjects eschatological-Christological statements which furnish continuity with the past and future on the basis of their present experience in suffering for the sake of their belief in Jesus Christ and the gospel.

The Unification of the Gospel of Mark through Myth

In contrast to those scholars who have emphasized the way in which the Gospel of Mark proclaims salvation through an historical scheme, some scholars have emphasized that the Marcan narrative acquires its unity by its expansion of a myth of salvation which was present in the mind of the Evangelist. This view was spearheaded by Rudolf Bultmann in his History of the Synoptic Tradition.[1] In this investigation of the synoptic tradition, which was first published in 1921, Bultmann presented a history of the sayings of Jesus and the narrative material about Jesus in the Christian communities before the time when they were incorporated into the Gospel narratives.[2] After he had presented his view of the history of these materials in their pre-synoptic stages, he wrote a section on the editing of these materials as they were placed within the Gospel narratives of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.[3] As he presented the editorial tendencies within each of these Gospels, he raised the question of the relationship of this final writing down of these traditions to the previous stages of the oral and partially written transmission.
During this presentation Bultmann came to the conclusion that the Gospel form was created by the Evangelist who produced the Gospel of Mark and that even though this form is to some extent a natural outgrowth of the Christian proclamation, its specific characteristic lies beyond any of the previous proclamations of the kerygmatic tradition in the early Church. The Gospel of Mark receives its particular character from its

---

[1] See publication data above, p. 1, n. 2.

[2] Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, pp. 1-317.

[3] Ibid., pp. 321-74.

"union of the Hellenistic kerygma about Christ, . . . with the tradition of the story of Jesus."[1] Since the essential content of the Hellenistic kerygma about Christ consisted in the Christ myth, especially as portrayed by Phil. 2:6-11 and Rom. 3:24, it is that myth of the kerygma which furnished the unity to the Marcan presentation.[2] The three essential elements of this myth are the pre-existence of Christ with God, the descent of Christ into a life of humiliation, and the ascent of Christ into exaltation. Bultmann went on to assert that the only essential element of the Christ myth which was not adoped by the Gospel of Mark was the pre-existence of Jesus.[3] Even though this element was not taken up by the Marcan Evangelist, the character and movement of the narrative indicates that "the Christ myth gives this book, the book of secret epiphanies, not indeed a biographical unity, but an unity based upon the myth of the kerygma."[4]

Recently, J. Schreiber has espoused Bultmann's assertion that the Christ myth of the Hellenistic Christian kerygma furnishes the unity to the Gospel of Mark.[5] In his investigation, Schreiber emphasized the central place of Phil. 2:6-11 in the Hellenistic kerygma and attempted to demonstrate that the Gospel of Mark contains each theme of the myth including the pre-existence of Christ--the one essential theme which

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 347.

[2] Cf. *ibid*., pp. 370-71. [3] *Ibid*., p. 348. [4] *Ibid*., p. 371.

[5] Originally worked out in Johannes Schreiber, "Der Kreuzigungsbericht des Markusevangeliums" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Friedrich-Wilhelm University, Bonn, 1960); available to us only in a condensation of it, Johannes Schreiber, "Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, LVIII (1961), 154-83.

Bultmann asserted that the Evangelist did not take over. Schreiber attempted to establish the presence of this theme by interpreting the verb apostello in the parable of the Vineyard in Mark 12:1-12 as a reference to the pre-existence and sending of Jesus by the Father.[1] This verb represents, in the view of Schreiber, the same view and theme in the Gospel of John, in the sending of Gnosis in the Gnostic systems, and in the traditions represented by Gal. 4:4 and Rom. 8:3. Secondly, Schreiber suggested that the messianic secret, a characteristic theme in the Marcan emphasis, represents an early fusion of the statement in I Cor. 2:8 ("None of the rulers of this age understood this; for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.") into the Christ myth represented by Phil. 2:6-11.[2] These assertions by Schreiber have not met with scholarly approval even though there are many other excellent suggestions in his work. His attempt to establish the theme of pre-existence in Mark is questionable because, first, the Evangelist's use of the parable of the Vineyard highlights scriptural fulfillment rather than pre-existence;[3] secondly, a view of pre-existence as the context for the baptism of Jesus cannot be substantiated from the narrative;[4] and, thirdly, the rest of the narrative suggests that Jesus is an especially authoritative human without ever having been pre-existent with God.[1] Schreiber's interpretation of the messianic secret through I Cor. 2:8 is inappropriate since the rulers who killed Jesus did so with the knowledge of who he was (according to the Evangelist).[2] Thus Schreiber's investigation, though highly suggestive about many parts of the narrative, has not been accepted as a proper interpretation of the Marcan narrative.

---

[1] Schreiber, "Christologie," pp. 166-67.

[2] Ibid., pp. 156-57.

[3] Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, trans. by S. H. Hooke (Rev. ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963).

[4] Strecker, "Zur Messiasgeheimnistheorie," pp. 94-95.

In James M. Robinson's study of the Gospel of Mark, mentioned above, he suggested that the cosmic battle between the powers of God and the powers of Satan had furnished the essential context for the Evangelist's presentation of his narrative. This myth was especially appropriate for the Evangelist to use to depict the eschatological dimension of Jesus' ministry since it was the central myth of apocalyptic thought.[3] So the Evangelist portrayed Jesus' ministry as a cosmic battle between the Satanic powers and the divine powers in the sphere of history on earth. Inaugurated in the Baptism and Temptation, this battle furnished the impetus in the narrative until the final victory over Satan through the cross and the resurrection. Thus, for Robinson, the central myth of apocalyptic thought (cosmic battle) furnishes an essential context in which the narrative participates. We have already dealt with the strength and weakness of this suggestion above,[1] and will not restate it here. It seems more probable that this myth has functioned in the traditions underlying the Gospel tradition rather than within the redactional activity of the Evangelist.

---

[1] See the critiques of Strecker, "Zur Messiasgeheimnistheorie," pp. 94-95; Philipp Vielhauer, "Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums," Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1965 [=Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag, ed. by Erich Dinkler (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1964)]), p. 156; Best, Temptation and Passion, pp. 125-33; Knigge, "Meaning," pp. 60-61.

[2] Ibid.

[3] This part of his investigation is emphasized more in the German edition, Das Geschichtsverständnis des Markusevangeliums, Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Bd. 49 [New Series] (2d ed.; Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959).

Ph. Vielhauer has suggested that the Marcan narrative is unified Christologically through the title Son of God eschatologically understood.[2] The dominant title in the Gospel is Son of God, and it occurs in the context of _theios anēr_ activity and as an eschatologically understood kingly title.[3] The title in its eschatologically oriented meaning occurs at three strategic points in the narrative (beginning--1:11; middle--9:7; end--15:39), and in the first two of these three instances the title issues from a heavenly voice in a stylized formula. Vielhauer proposed that these three episodes in the Gospel represent the three stages of the Egyptian enthronement ceremony (adoption, proclamation, acclamation). This ceremony had been discussed by E. Norden as an extant form within the Hellenistic world which underlies I Tim. 3:16 and the Gospel birth narratives in the New Testament.[4] Hence it is possible that the ceremony is known to the Evangelist and has furnished the structure upon which he has built his narrative about the Son of God. The title also occurs, however, in episodes where Jesus' activity is that of the Hellenistic divine man (3:11; 5:7; cf. 1:24). Vielhauer takes these to be "illegitimate" announcements by the demons characterizing Jesus as a _theios anēr_.[5]

---

[1] See above, pp. 9-10. [2] Vielhauer, "Erwägungen," pp. 155-69.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 165. [4] _Ibid._, p. 167. [5] _Ibid._, p. 166.

These announcements are met with commands to secrecy because they do not represent the Evangelist's view of Jesus. However, these "illegitimate" announcements accentuate the eschatological character of the Son of God's activity: they are coordinated with the royally understood use of the title in 9:7, and, finally, are subsumed under and absorbed into the "legitimate" royal-eschatological understanding of the title.[1]

Vielhauer's thesis is extremely attractive for the manner in which it incorporates the eschatologically authoritative ministry of Jesus into the title Son of God. Even though his view of the legitimate and illegitimate confessions in the Gospel is difficult to affirm, his view of the unity of the narrative takes into consideration that the Evangelist has prefixed his account of the passion narrative with an account of the ministry of Jesus. Bultmann's view of the Christ myth without the theme of pre-existence left the first half of the Gospel in a fractured status with regard to its place in the unity which the myth provided. Schreiber's assertion of the presence of pre-existence in the narrative attempted to give a dimension to the ministry of Jesus which does not reside in the narrative itself. While Robinson's view of the eschatological dimension of the historical ministry of Jesus was an excellent insight, still his extension of this thesis into a cosmic dimension for the entire ministry of Jesus on earth does not seem to account for the redactional activity in that part of the narrative. Vielhauer has incorporated the strongest part of Robinson's thesis into his view by defining Jesus' authoritative ministry as "illegitimate" by itself but eschatologically oriented toward understanding Jesus as the royal-eschatological Son of God. On the other hand, however, Vielhauer has not given due status to the title Son of man in the Gospel nor to the expectation of his parousia in the imminent future. In Mark, Jesus does not represent the Cosmokrator in heaven until he comes in the parousia. That is the problem to which Conzelmann has so aptly pointed in his analysis of Mark 13. Christ seems to have had very little meaning for the Evangelist as the great ruler in the heavens; rather, the good news about Jesus Christ was comprised in the authoritative ministry which led to suffering as the Son of man and the expectation of his coming as the Son of man in power and glory in the future. The assurance that he would come in the future resided, to a great extent, in the eschatological authority of his ministry upon earth. The immediate necessity, however, was willingness to suffer as he suffered rather than the faith to turn to him in his power and glory to receive forgiveness and wisdom.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 165.

The Gospel of Mark as Narration of Kerygma

In particular the discussions of the mythic unity of Mark pointed toward the kerygmatic nature of the Marcan narrative. The myth which was suggested as furnishing the structure within the Marcan narrative had also furnished the structure within certain kerygmatic hymns and formulas. In contrast to this search for the mythic structure within the Gospel which had resided in the kerygma, W. Marxsen began a project of ascertaining the "directly kerygmatic" purpose[1] of the Marcan Gospel. In his four studies in Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums,[2] first published in 1956, he suggested that the Evangelist had arranged and composed his material "backwards" from the passion kerygma and that the Evangelist's concept of gospel is instructive for understanding his particular view of his narrative as proclamation.

---

[1] Knigge's phrase in "The Meaning," p. 64.

[2] See publication data above, p. 1, n. 3.

The broadening of the kerygma "backwards" from the passion narrative is especially evident from his analysis of the John the Baptist material. As the Evangelist presented John the Baptist, his purpose was not to set up a historical sequence between Jesus and the Baptist or to teach about the Baptist, but to present the "theological and Christological" relationship between them.[1] The tradition of the Baptist has been rearranged and rewritten "backwards" from the passion narrative. As the Evangelist narrates the story of the Baptist looking back from the vantage point of Jesus' passion and resurrection, the gospel proclamation forms the base upon which the story of the Baptist is presented. First of all, the forgiveness of sins which Jesus effected by his death and resurrection (I Cor. 15:3) is preached by the Baptist (1:4); secondly, Jesus' death and resurrection according to the scriptures (kata tas graphas--I Cor. 15:3) is now extended "backwards" through the Baptist--hence the Baptist prepares the way by coming in the wilderness according to the scriptures (Mal. 3:1; Isa. 40:3); and thirdly, the Baptist even shares the fate of Jesus by being "delivered up" (1:14)--the same terminology (paradothēnai) used for the fate of Jesus in the passion (I Cor. 11:23).[2] Thus it is not the intention of the Evangelist to emphasize a time sequence; the Baptist comes "before" Jesus on a theological basis, i.e. an inner connection on the basis of theological content. Contrary, then, to James M. Robinson's work (Robinson's and Marxsen's works were independent from one another but must be compared) the introduction to Mark (1:1-13) represents a rewriting of the Baptist tradition on the basis of the proclamation of Jesus' death and resurrection. This means that the "beginning" (1:1) which Robinson had emphasized as a "historical" beginning is for the Marcan Evangelist simply a "theological or kerygmatic" beginning. Matthew and Luke presented a "beginning" with an eye toward a "historical" schema, but for Mark it is a "kerygmatic beginning"--a beginning not concerned with chronology but with the proclamation of the gospel. Robinson's emphasis that the "preaching of the gospel" in 1:14-15 stands in contrast with the "beginning of the gospel" in 1:1 is not to be interpreted from the perspective of proclamation versus historical occurrence (as Robinson does). Rather, an interpretation "backwards" from the passion, which took place according to scripture, clarifies that the gospel begins with fulfillment of scripture. Thus, the tradition of the Baptist stands in Mark, not to report about the Baptist or tell about the places he visited, but as theological and Christological preparation for Jesus' ministry. The Marcan Evangelist's intention was not to historicize the kerygma (Matthew and, even more, Luke moved in that direction), but to kerygmatize the narrative tradition--in this instance, to interpret the eschatological Baptist tradition from the viewpoint of the passion kerygma.

---

[1] Marxsen, Markus, pp. 17-26. [2] Ibid., p. 23.

The Marcan Evangelist's concept of gospel (euangelion) sheds further light on the kerygmatic nature of the narrative. Through a comparison of the vocabulary in the synoptic Gospels, it is noticeable that Mark always has the substantive euangelion (gospel) and Luke always the verb euangelizesthai (to preach the gospel). Further, while the opening verse in Mark designates the writing as a euangelion, the opening verse in Matthew specifies that document as a biblos (book). These variations in vocabulary usage open up the possibility that the Marcan Evangelist has a somewhat different understanding of the euangelion which he was writing than the Matthean and Lucan Evangelists had for their narratives. Through an investigation of the Marcan Evangelist's use of the term euangelion and his addition of it to the phrase "for my sake" (heneken emou), Marxsen proposes that "the gospel presents the Risen One and that the Risen One is present in the gospel."[1] Therefore, the Marcan Gospel is not meant as a "life of Jesus," nor as a historicization. Rather, the narrative is a commentary on the concept gospel, an exegesis in the form of early Christian proclamation.[2] The Evangelist has intended to avoid historicizing by condensing his material and by broadening his narrative "backwards" from the passion kerygma. The condensation is oriented toward proclamation--direct confrontation. The extension of the narrative "backwards" creates two "opposing movements" which interpenetrate each other--the movement from the passion kerygma "backwards" and the movement of the story from John the Baptist forward.[3] By setting these two impulses against each other, the Marcan Evangelist "intends to avoid the historicizing which appears to result when the tradition is arranged in sequence."[4] The Marcan Gospel is meant to be proclamation, preaching of the Risen Christ (both objective and subjective genitive). The Matthean and Lucan Gospels break up the condensation, reflect upon historical periods of salvation, and historicize the tradition into a biblos (book) about Jesus (Matthew) and a bios (life) of Jesus (Luke).

---

[1] Quoted by Knigge, "The Meaning," pp. 64-65, from Marxsen, Markus, p. 92.

[2] Marxsen, Markus, p. 92.

[3] Willi Marxsen, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. by G. Buswell (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), pp. 134-35.

[4] Knigge, "The Meaning," p. 64.

Marxsen's suggestion that the Marcan Gospel is meant to be "directly kerygmatic" is a significant step forward in the discussion. Unfortunately, Marxsen's work has perhaps not had the impact which it should since many scholars have disagreed with his proposal, on the basis of the redactional activity in geographical locations and in chapter 13, that the Gospel was written in Galilee where Christians who had fled there during the Jewish Wars were awaiting the parousia of the Son of man.[1] His insights that the Evangelist views his Gospel as a proclamation of the Risen Christ and that a basic feature of this proclamation is the extension of it "backwards" from the passion kerygma should inform the further investigations of Mark.

The work of Ernest Best, which appeared in 1965 as a monograph entitled The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology, set out in a somewhat different way "to determine the Markan kerugma."[2] He noticed that two variant forms of the kerygma were present in Paul's writings: Phil. 2:6-11 and I Cor. 15:3-5. Phil. 2:6-11 emphasizes the encounter of Jesus and God with the cosmic forces of evil while I Cor. 15:3-5 emphasizes primarily the problem of human sin: "Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures." Best then countered Bultmann, Robinson, and Schreiber, who have all emphasized the nearness of the proclamation of Mark to Phil. 2:6-11, and suggested that the end product of the Marcan Gospel is probably not to say that the cosmic forces of evil had been overcome in Jesus' life, death, and resurrection, but to indicate primarily that Christ had dealt with human sin.[1]

---

[1] See Knigge, "The Meaning," pp. 65-66. [2] Best, The Temptation, p. x.

To this end, Best investigated the understanding of "testing" which was current in Judaism and the Old Testament, and noticed the Marcan Evangelist's cryptic reference to the temptation with the conclusion that Jesus "was with the wild beasts and angels ministered to him."[2] Best entertained the possibility that the Evangelist viewed the temptation as having been a testing of the powers of Satan against the powers of God in which it was clear that Jesus and God were victorious over Satan, and indeed Satan is bound and helpless during Jesus' ministry. An amazingly close parallel to this understanding of the Messiah's work is to be found in Test. of Levi 18:5-12:

> The heavens shall exult in his days, and the earth shall be glad, and the clouds shall rejoice, and the angels of the glory of the presence of the Lord shall be glad in him. The heavens shall be opened, and from the temple of glory shall come upon him sanctification, with the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac. And the glory of the Most High shall be uttered over him, and the spirit of understanding and sanctification shall rest upon him . . . And he shall give to the saints to eat from the tree of life, and the spirit of holiness shall be on them. And Beliar shall be bound by him, and he shall give power to His children to tread upon the evil spirits.[3]

Best pointed to the Beelzebul controversy in Mark 3:20-30 where it is clearly stated that Satan cannot cast out Satan, and indeed the strong man must be "bound" first and then his house may be plundered. This is a statement by the Marcan Evangelist in which it should be clear to the reader that in the temptation Jesus has bound Satan, and that during his ministry, death, and resurrection Satan's house is being plundered. Satan's underlings, the demons, are cast out and are powerless against Jesus since their master has already been bound, and instead the sin and evil which is grounded always within man can be dealt with by Jesus' ministry and death upon the cross.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 190-91. [2] Ibid., p. x.

[3] Quotation taken from Robinson, Problem, p. 27.

Now, instead of seeing the exorcism narratives to be the primary unit in Mark as Robinson had, Best points out that exorcisms are simply part of the teaching of Jesus.[1] Best has much evidence on his side, for Jesus' synagogue teaching in Mark includes the performance of exorcisms. Thus, as early as 1:21-28, Jesus teaches with great authority in the synagogue, and, when he casts out the unclean spirit within a man, the crowd's response is: "What is this, a new teaching? With authority he commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him" (1:27). This is the first portrayal of Jesus' ministry by the Evangelist after Jesus' first act of calling Simon and Andrew, and James and John. Thus the Evangelist's interest lies more in Jesus' teaching than simply in Jesus' exorcisms. Now all that Jesus says and does deals with sin and evil in man--in world forces in man (demons), in hostile people (scribes, Pharisees, and even disciples), and finally even with the evil which tempts man from within, as Jesus himself is tempted at Gethsemane not to take the cup placed before him if it could be avoided. The entire teaching of Jesus in Mark now includes: the exorcisms that are a part of that teaching; the dialogues with scribes and Pharisees and even with the disciples, where the climactic statement of Jesus is the comparison of Peter's disagreement with the attitude of Satan; and finally the evil inherent in man himself, as the man Jesus encounters temptation in Gethsemane. Jesus overcame even the evil inherent within himself, died on the cross for our sins, and was raised by God as a triumph over sin and evil in man.[1]

---

[1] Best, The Temptation, pp. 18-23, 68-74.

The strength of Best's presentation lies within the way it explains the unity of the first part of the Gospel with the last--Jesus' teaching begins in chapter 1 (containing healings, exorcisms, and parables) and continues up through chapter 15 after which Jesus is betrayed and crucified. Thus his investigation is a step towards an understanding of the positive statement of the overall movement of the Gospel narrative. Furthermore, much of Best's work would seem to be supported by E. Schweizer's investigation of the Marcan vocabulary.[2] Schweizer has shown that the words "to teach" (didaskein) and "teaching" (didachē) are used twenty times for Jesus only (there is only one exception) in Marcan summaries, in links between pericopes, and in brief remarks in parentheses. However, the Marcan Evangelist never calls Jesus a teacher, nor is the content of his teaching emphasized or summarized. Thus the fact of Jesus' teaching is decisive in the Gospel, but there is no emphasis on its content which should be transmitted through the Church for instruction. The teaching is often paralleled with Jesus' miracles and the intention seems to be to describe the dimension in which Jesus lives, acts, and speaks--the dimension of authority. In addition to this aspect of the Marcan emphasis, the word "to preach" (kērussein) is used twice of the Baptist, the Twelve, and the Church, and three times of Jesus. The content of this preaching is repentance (metanoia) and gospel

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 190-91. [2] Schweizer, "Anmerkungen," pp. 35-46.

(euangelion), and while both of these terms are traditional, they appear in Marcan redactional passages. Hence the Marcan Evangelist's concept of eschatological salvation is in terms of the proclamation of the gospel from the time of the Baptist to the preaching in the Church. The particular function of Jesus' ministry in this time is to give "authority" to the entire proclamation and activity of the Church.

Consequently, an alternative (and quite satisfactory) approach to Mark is that of understanding and interpreting that Gospel as a "directly kerygmatic" statement within the early Church. The Gospel is motivated not by an intention to historicize (leading to reflection upon epochs of salvation history) nor by the desire to unify the Church's kerygma through myth, but by the purpose of proclaiming to the Church the good news. The crux of the matter is to determine why the Evangelist chose to proclaim the good news in the form of the story of Jesus' earthly ministry. Perhaps a further step toward understanding this choice of form will be clarified by investigating the Christological impulses within the Marcan narrative.

Kerygma and Christological Formulations

In recent years the discussion of the kerygma of the early Church has moved into investigations of the Christology of the early Church. In 1957 O. Cullmann published Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments which argued that the oldest confessions of the Church were "expressed exclusively in Christological terms."[1] This early Christological interest, however, did not center upon the nature or natures of Christ as the later Christological controversies did, but upon his function and work: "When it is asked in the New Testament 'Who is Christ?', the question never means exclusively or even primarily, 'What is his nature?', but first of all, 'What is his function?'"[1] The answers given to Jesus' function, in Cullmann's view, are given "in the form of familiar titles, each describing at the same time a function and a work to be accomplished."[2] From this perspective, Cullmann carried out an investigation of the Christological titles in the entire New Testament, discussing first their place in Judaism and Hellenism, then their significance in Jesus' ministry, and finally their function in the early Church. This work by Cullmann has encouraged the study of the traditions in the New Testament from the viewpoint of Christological confessions which described Jesus' function and work. But Cullmann declared himself methodologically opposed to most of the work of form criticism in favor of his own method which he called phenomenological.[3] His "phenomenological" method, however, is designed to stress the "uniqueness" of Jesus himself,[4] and this brings into the work assertions concerning Jesus' self-consciousness and reflection that are not well supported by the history of those traditions in the early Church. Cullmann simply assumed that there was a direct continuity between the historical Jesus and the early Church and that the texts in the New Testament reveal the self-consciousness of Jesus in his ministry. The key affirmation in this line is that Jesus' uniqueness lay in his creative combination of the ideas of the Son of man and the Servant, and in his conscious manifestation of this combination in his own life.[5] This position overlooked much which had been learned about the proclamations of the early Church during the previous fifty years of scholarly discussion. Consequently, while Cullmann's work is a first major Christology of the New Testament which approaches the problem from a study of the titles in the early Church, his conclusions have met major criticism.

---

[1] Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall, The New Testament Library (Rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), p. 1.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 3-4. [2] Ibid., p. 5. [3] Ibid., pp. 7-9.

[4] Ibid., p. 5. [5] Ibid., pp. 51, 82, 161-64.

The matters which Cullmann ignored in his study were addressed in 1959 by W. Marxsen in two lectures compiled into a published essay, Anfangsprobleme der Christologie.[1] In order to ascertain the beginning point of Christology, Marxsen postulated that one must first address the question of the continuity between the historical Jesus and the kerygma. R. Bultmann had set this problem for New Testament scholarship by placing the teaching of Jesus in the period of Judaism in his book Primitive Christianity,[2] and E. Käsemann had raised the problem anew in his lecture "The Problem of the Historical Jesus"[3] in 1953.

Bultmann had asserted that the texts which we have come to us out of the Church's proclamation, the kerygma. Furthermore, the proclamation of the Church concerned itself only with the fact that Jesus had lived and died. Thus the kerygma is not concerned with displaying Jesus' self-consciousness; rather, it proclaimed him as Christ (a first Christological statement). In addition, an examination of the earliest traditions in the New Testament reveals that Jesus most likely did not proclaim himself to be the Messiah nor did he designate himself by any titles such as Son of

---

[1] (5th ed.; Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher, 1967.

[2] Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting, trans. by R. H. Fuller, Meridian Books (9th ed.; Cleveland: The World Publishing Co., 1964).

[3] Essays on New Testament Themes, trans. by W. J. Montague, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 41 (2d ed.; London: S. C. M. Press, 1965), pp. 15-47.

God, etc.[1] At most, he may have spoken of the Son of man as a figure in the end time who would ratify his own announcements of the kingdom of God. But Jesus' ministry consisted of a call upon people to radical obedience. This demand of Jesus came with such authority that it was an implicit claim to be important in God's saving activity. Jesus' own demands, then, were implicitly Christological, but these demands had no explicit theological meaning centered upon Jesus himself during his ministry.[2] Upon this implicit claim in Jesus' ministry, the early Church built its _explicit_ Christological statements about Jesus after his crucifixion. Thus Jesus' proclamation is a presupposition for New Testament theology, and in the New Testament we encounter the ways in which the early Church developed explicit Christological statements upon the implicit claims of Jesus in his ministry.

E. Käsemann, in his lecture in 1953,[3] discussed anew the problem of the continuity between the historical Jesus and the kerygma of the early Church. In his discussion he suggested that the character of the continuity must be discovered primarily through an analysis of the Gospels, for "the Gospels alone present the tidings of the Christ within the framework of the story of the earthly life of Jesus."[4] They, most of all, in the New Testament mitigate against a docetic view of salvation--they identify the act of salvation with Jesus' earthly life. Analysis of the Gospels, however, indicates that the undergirding motivation for telling the good news in the story of Jesus' life and death was the intersecting of the eschatological events in the story of Jesus' life.[1] The eschatological situation of the early Church is interconnected with the eschatological dimension of Jesus' life and death. Consequently, the form which that story of Jesus' life takes is dependent upon the eschatological view which the writer envisions.[2] The Gospel writers identify the Lord of the Church with the historical Jesus. Therefore:

---

[1] Rudolf Bultmann, _Jesus and the Word_, trans. by Louise P. Smith and Erminie H. Lantero (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958); cf. _Theology of the New Testament_, trans. by Kendrick Grobel (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), I, 26-32.

[2] Bultmann, _Theology_, I, 43.

[3] Käsemann, "Historical Jesus," pp. 15-47. [4] _Ibid._, p. 21.

> The historical Jesus meets us in the New Testament, our only real and original documentation of him, not as an isolated individual, but as the Lord of the community which believes in him.[3]

We encounter the historical Jesus only through the kerygma, and in the kerygma the early Church "interprets out of its own experience what for it has already become mere history and employs for this purpose the medium of its preaching."[4] For this reason we run abruptly into the paradox that:

> the community takes so much trouble to maintain historical continuity with him who once trod this earth that it allows the historical events of this earthly life to pass for the most part into oblivion and replaces them by its own message.[5]

This review of Bultmann and Käsemann leads into Marxsen's attempt to locate the beginning point of Christology. With Bultmann's way of stating the situation, the first steps of the early Church were to interpret Jesus' death and life in terms of explicit Christological formulations. These Christological formulations lie at the center of the kerygma of the early Church. From Käsemann's emphases, Marxsen can say that inasmuch as the Evangelists proclaimed their message in the framework of the story of the earthly life of Jesus because in that story the eschatological events intersect, the Christological problem before us is not that of arriving at the "historical" material which lies _prior_ to the Christological, but the historical can only be ascertained _through_ the Christological in the New Testament writings.[1] Further, the historical dimension which lies behind the Christological statements in the New Testament involves a believer and Jesus; in other words, the beginning point of Christology is the reflection of a believer on his relationship to Jesus.[2] Through an analysis of the Son of man traditions, Marxsen arrived at the conclusion that the beginning of Christology lies in the eschatologically qualified relation of the believer to Jesus.[3] This relationship had already begun during Jesus' ministry as the disciple grounded the validity of his belief about God's activity on the authoritative ministry of Jesus. After Jesus' crucifixion, the believer proclaimed that Jesus' work had been vindicated by God in the resurrection. This eschatological vindication of Jesus now defined the eschatological situation for the believer. The believer's faith was now grounded in the eschatological vindication of Jesus. In this moment the believer defined the function of Jesus Christologically--Jesus and his work were God's acts of salvation for men. This produced two Christological tendencies in the Church: either Jesus was described as a man with special power--a divine miracle worker, etc.--or this function was objectified in a title transferred upon him--Son of man, Son of God, Lord, etc.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 30. [2] Ibid., p. 29. [3] Ibid., p. 23. [4] Ibid., p. 20.

[5] Ibid.

---

[1] Marxsen, _Anfangsprobleme_, p. 18.

[2] _Ibid._, pp. 19-20. [3] _Ibid._, pp. 28-30.

H. E. Tödt carried through an investigation of the Son of man title which followed the same kind of approach that Marxsen suggests.[2] Tödt isolated the traditions in Q, Mark, Matthew, and Luke to establish a history of the Christological application of the Son of man title in the Church. Having separated these out, he examined the soteriological use of the title Son of man in Jesus' ministry and discussed the transition from that use to the Christological use of the title in the early Church.[3]

The soteriological use of Son of man in Jesus' ministry, he posits, centers on the "authority" embedded within that ministry. In none of the authentic Son of man sayings does Jesus identify himself with the Son of man in the future. Rather, the Son of man is referred to by Jesus as a heavenly figure other than himself who will validate the claims which he is making in his ministry. Thus, he who follows Jesus' demands will be in good stead when he meets the Son of man at the end of the age. Jesus' reference to Son of man was, therefore, a soteriological one--the one who followed Jesus' demands would enter into the proper action by which God through the Son of man would grant him salvation. But the Son of man would determine the believer's destiny, not Jesus. Jesus used the title Son of man to point the way to salvation--soteriologically--but he did not claim that he himself would grant the believer entrance into the kingdom of God.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 52.

[2] The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton, The New Testament Library (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965).

[3] Ibid., p. 226.

In the early Palestinian community which collected Q, we observe the reflection of the believer which produced the first Christological use of the title Son of man. This community valued Jesus' teaching as primary in view of the imminent coming of God's reign.[1] Thus it uttered charismatically the sayings of Jesus available to them from his ministry. Of great interest were the sayings concerning the Son of man's coming in the future, but also the other teaching of Jesus, integrally connected with the coming kingdom of God, was repeated by them. In this context, they came to the insight that, since Jesus had been resurrected by God after his death, Jesus himself would come as the Son of man. This identification of Jesus and the Son of man was the first Christological step of the early community.[2] With it the community connected the granting of salvation directly with a function of the Risen One in the future.

Also, however, as the community uttered Jesus' authoritative teaching they almost unconsciously placed the Son of man title in sayings concerning Jesus' earthly activity. By this means, the Son of man title came to carry the exousia which Jesus had displayed in his ministry. It is essential to notice, however, that when the Son of man title was placed into the sayings of earthly activity, the transcendent power of the heavenly Son of man was not transferred with it. Instead, the name designated that essential authority which Jesus' teachings embodied which gave them continued validity in face of the coming kingdom of God.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 239. [2] Ibid., p. 230.

Independently from this stratum of the Son of man tradition, the suffering Son of man sayings were developed in the context of the scriptural necessity for the passion. Even these, however, did not contain the transcendent emphasis of the heavenly Son of man, but the paradox that the authoritative Son of man was delivered up by God to men who killed him. Yet even in these traditions the paradoxical correlation of sovereignty and humiliation observable in Phil. 2:6-11 is not to be found until Mark 10:45 is constructed out of a saying concerning serving.

This means, therefore, that the earliest Christological cognition of the Christian community did not express itself in terms of the paradoxical intertwining of humiliation and sovereignty in Jesus Christ. The Christological steps in the early community are discernible first in identifying Jesus with the Son of man who would come in the future and next in using the title Son of man to convey the authority which was implicit in Jesus' teaching.

Ferd. Hahn, with a knowledge of Tödt's results, investigated the full range of major titles which appear in the early traditions.[1] Sharing with Tödt the interest in isolating the Christological traditions in the New Testament, Hahn analyzed the titles kurios, christos, Son of David, Son of God, and Prophet according to the transformation of their meaning in the various circles of the Church.

Fundamental to his study is the view that the Palestinian Jewish Christian community was not led to discuss Jesus' Christological function as if he were now established in an exalted position in heaven. This

---

[1] Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity, trans. by Harold Knight and George Ogg (London: Lutterworth Press, 1969).

Christological conception of the Risen One's work was developed only later in Hellenistic Jewish Christianity as "the first consistent attempt to make allowance for the fact of the delay of the parousia . . ."[1] The Christology of Palestinian Christianity was organized consistently around Jesus' end time work when he would come with all authority invested in him by God. They understood that imminently Jesus would come as Son of man and Lord as the appointed Messiah in the last days. His Christological function, then, still lay in future expectation.

Alongside of this, the earthly work of Jesus occupied a significant place in the Palestinian community. Though this activity was not interpreted messianically, its authoritative status was reinforced through the titles "Master," "Lord," and "Son" applied to Jesus in the proclamation of this material. Jesus' working of miracles was understood in the framework of conceptions surrounding the charismatic men of the Old Testament, and the passion events were interpreted in terms of scriptural necessity.

In Hellenistic Jewish Christianity "the conception of exaltation was developed . . . and . . . the Messiah conception was carried over step by step to the earthly Jesus."[2] Jesus' function in heavenly exaltation was constructed especially in connection with Ps. 110:1. Through this passage, the confession of Jesus as Lord came to be a recognition of the Risen Lord's interrelation with the present believing community from his position of enthronement at the right hand of God.

Coordinately, Jesus' earthly ministry came into full strength as the emphasis upon the Old Testament men of God was encouraged by the theios anēr motif within the Hellenistic culture in which it was situated. While still the community, Jewish in heritage, rejected the concept that any man, even Jesus, could be divine in nature, the possession of the powers of God, associated with an act of appointment, established his earthly ministry clearly within God's activity.

---

[1] _Ibid._, pp. 348-49. [2] _Ibid._, p. 348.

In Hellenistic Gentile Christianity Jesus was interpreted as a divine being, either pre-existent or divinely begotten, who nevertheless became human. In this context Jesus was confessed as kurios and Son of God, while the Son of man and Son of David traditions disappeared completely, and christos became simply a proper name.

Accordingly, for Hahn the use of Christological titles by early Christianity reveals quite different emphases upon the work of Christ in the different environments in which the Church was situated. The titles at the earliest stage were used to depict Jesus' end time work. During this stage the community did not conceive of present activity by the risen Lord, but awaited his triumphant return in the future. In the Hellenistic Jewish environment, however, the Church developed a two-stage Christology which emphasized, on the one hand, the risen Lord's present function in exaltation and, on the other hand, his divinely appointed ministry while on earth. Still, however, at this stage he was not perceived as divine. The assertion of his divine status arose only when Christianity moved directly into Hellenistic Gentile circles, and then only did the titles kurios and Son of God designate Jesus as a divine being who became human.

Relying heavily upon the work of Tödt and Hahn, R. H. Fuller produced his book entitled The Foundations of New Testament Christology.[1] Fuller wished to strengthen, over Tödt and Hahn, "a direct line of continuity between Jesus' self-understanding and the church's christological interpretation of him."[2] He did this especially by arguing that Jesus, knowing that his death would be certain, went into Jerusalem "to issue his eschatological challenge at the heart and centre of Judaism,"[3] and held a last feast with his disciples to explain to them his understanding of his death as "a part of God's eschatological action in him."[4] Fuller arranged his book around the "three successive environments in which the church was operating"[5] which, while furnishing clarity to his presentation, removes some of the fluidity of interpretation which surely existed in and between these environments as bilingual believers encountered both Palestinian and Hellenistic Jewish communities, and Paul confronted both Hellenistic Jewish and Hellenistic Gentile groups.[6]

Both of these factors, however, mostly indicate Fuller's way of approaching his task rather than his overall achievement. Fuller's substantial variation from Tödt and Hahn lies in his concentration on the traditions concerning the "First" or "Heavenly" man and the Gnostic Redeemer myth. In these investigations, Fuller focused his attention upon an emphasis by Cullmann that in I Cor. 15:45-47 the Son of man and the Heavenly man converge so that Paul, in his presentation of the First and Last Adam, formulates a Christian tradition "entirely in agreement with Jesus' self-consciousness."[1] Fuller, after discussing the germane passages in Philo and other Jewish materials, reinforces Cullmann's insight into the separate development of the Palestinian eschatologically redemptive Son of man and the Hellenistic Jewish ctisiological "First" or "Heavenly" man.[2] This distinction, when consistently followed, clarifies that Paul's connection of the Heavenly man with the eschatological redeemer is a peculiarly Pauline development which "occurred _after_ the term Son of man had been replaced by 'Christ' in the context of the parousia (I Cor. 15:22f.)"[3] Hence, Paul did not here bring together again the Heavenly man and the Son of man,[4] and the doubtful relationship of Paul's Adam/Christ typology to the Church's view of the Son of man makes still more difficult any relationship of Paul's view to Jesus' understanding of the Son of man.[5]

---

[1] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965).

[2] Ibid., p. 15. [3] Ibid., p. 107. [4] Ibid., p. 108. [5] Ibid., p. 16.

[6] Fuller himself alludes to this, ibid., p. 183.

Fuller brings this understanding into his later section on the Gnostic Redeemer myth to show that "the so-called pre-Christian (or Iranian) redeemer myth," as reconstructed by Reitzenstein and followed by Bultmann, did not exist. Rather, we have firmly embedded a two-part revelation myth: one part, reformed by Philo in his interpretation of Genesis and his Platonism, contains "the first man who falls from the world of light and enters the thralldom of the material world, . . . and becomes the inclusive head of all the human race"; the other part, from the _chokma-sophia_ tradition in Judaism, consists of "the heavenly wisdom or revelation, which enters the world through a series of emissaries in each successive generation, bringing the gnosis which will release man from his fallen condition."[1] He posits, therefore, a "pre-Christian gnostic revelation myth,"[2] which then furnishes the structure by which he can more clearly analyze the Christological hymns within the Hellenistic Gentile environment.[3]

---

[1] Cullmann, _Christology_, p. 166. [2] Fuller, _Foundations_, pp. 76-78.

[3] _Ibid._, p. 78, his italics.

[4] He posits that they probably have a remote common origin, _ibid._, p. 78.

[5] _Ibid._, n. 53, p. 84 and p. 121.

Thus, in Fuller's investigation of the New Testament Christological traditions there is a slight movement toward a Cullmann-like emphasis upon a direct continuity between Jesus and the Church; yet, in his analysis of the Christological traditions his care in isolating the independent developments distinguishes him as an Anglo-American New Testament scholar who has directly contributed to the rather recent interest in the New Testament Christological traditions.

Throughout these recent discussions and investigations, then, the interest has come to center around the Christological impulses within the kerygmatic traditions of early Christianity. It is this interest which directs our study of the Gospel of Mark. Hence our objective is not to obtain an overall theology of that Gospel, but to describe the Christological impulses which have influenced the Evangelist as he constructed his narrative. This will be attained by inquiry into the Evangelist's reflection upon the function of Jesus in the early Christian community and by analysis of the correlation of titles with the activity of Jesus in the narrative.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 96.

[2] Ibid., p. 97.

[3] Ibid., pp. 203-27.

Kerygma and the Structure of the Marcan Narrative

Having formulated the dimensions of the study of Christology in the New Testament writings and indicated the recent works in this area, we can return to a special dimension of the study of Mark. E. Schweizer has had another major interest besides that of the Marcan vocabulary: delineating the sections in Mark. His analyses bring us to the significance of the structure of the Marcan narrative in relation to its intent to proclaim the kerygma.

For Schweizer, the Marcan Gospel consists of an introduction and five major sections. The introduction is contained in 1:1-13, and the five major sections are to be divided as follows: (a) 1:14-3:6; (b) 3:7-6:6a; (c) 6:6b-8:26; (d) 8:27-10:52; (e) 11:1-16:8.[1]

Schweizer's initial proposal with regard to the structure of the Marcan narrative concerns the first half of the Gospel. In that expanse of the narrative a pattern is three times repeated in which there is a climaxing conflict at the end of a section, a new section beginning with a summary, and a call to disciples immediately following the beginning summary.[2] The formulation of his view begins with the position, shared by many, that 1:1-13 constitutes the introduction to the Gospel. Hence, the first section of the Gospel begins in 1:14 and ends in 3:6. In the first section, 1:14-3:6, the sequence proceeds as follows: after the temptation (the conflict--1:12-13), a new section begins with a summary at 1:14-15 and is followed by the call of four disciples in 1:16-20.

---

[1] Eduard Schweizer, Das Evangelium nach Markus, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Bd. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1967); also "Leistung," pp. 337-55, and "Contribution," pp. 421-32.

[2] Schweizer, "Contribution," pp. 421-26; "Leistung," pp. 343, 344, 347.

In the second section, 3:7-6:6, the sequence is: after the plot of 3:6, the summary in 3:7-12 is followed by the appointment of the Twelve. In the third section, 6:7-8:26: after the rejection in Nazareth in 6:1-6, the short summary in 6:7a is followed by the mission of the disciples (6:7b-13). In each instance, Jesus' reaction to the heightened conflict initiates a new section in the first half of the Marcan narrative.

The second half of the Gospel begins with the Caesarea Philippi pericope (8:27-33).[1] This episode forms the pivotal point in Jesus' ministry in which, in response to Peter's confession, Jesus "begins to teach them." More than any other section in the Gospel, this fourth section, 8:27-10:52, is constructed out of sayings of Jesus. Conflict continues to heighten, however, as the disciples fail to understand, and the implication grows that the only way that undestanding will take place is by following Jesus. This section ends with the blind Bartimaeus who, as an example of a true disciple, is made to see and follow "in the way." Section five, 11:1-16:8, portrays the death of Jesus which issues from the hostility, and the section is capstoned by the confession of a Gentile who, seeing the crucifixion, recognizes Jesus as the Son of God. In this way the Marcan Gospel builds its message that the world is so blind that it is unable to recognize God despite all of God's efforts to reveal himself. The secret messiahship is actually the hiddenness of God in Jesus which, despite all its manifestations, is not seen by a blind world, is often totally misunderstood, and opens itself only to the follower who goes, himself, on the road of Jesus.[1]

---

[1] Schweizer, "Contribution," pp. 427-29; "Leistung," pp. 348-49.

Schweizer proposes that the five sections of the Gospel of Mark develop a theme that people are blind to God's activity and thus misunderstand the way of salvation provided for them by God. The positive statement of this Gospel consists of a proclamation that this blindness is removed only by following Jesus to his cross. In this way the Marcan Evangelist connected the kerygma firmly to the historical Jesus and countered the Gnostic tendency to attach it to the announcement of a Saviour such as Hermes or Attis.[2] Schweizer's explication of the Marcan theology derives from his analysis of the Evangelist's organization of community tradition around a particular narrative structure, and that structure is comprised of five sections which occur after the introduction, which consists of 1:1-13.

L. E. Keck picked up this challenge laid down by Schweizer to view the Marcan theology in direct relation to the structure of the Gospel and proposed a slightly different view of the first half of the Gospel. In his two articles,[3] he asserted that Mark 1:14-15 and 3:7-12 are summaries which end sections in Mark rather than begin them as Schweizer had argued. This view leads him to suggest that the introduction consists of 1:1-15, and the three sections making up the first half of the Gospel are: (a) 1:16-3:12; (b) 3:13-6:7a; (c) 6:7b-8:26.

Mark 1:14-15 is a summary statement at the end of the introduction, in Keck's view.[1] He points out, in agreement with Marxsen, that euangelion is a favorite term of the Evangelist and appears throughout the Gospel because of the Evangelist's placing it there. Euangelion appears both in 1:1 and in 1:14, 15. Since, by examination of the entire Gospel, euangelion is a prominent feature in the Marcan proclamation, and because euangelion means both the good news about Jesus Christ and the good news which Jesus Christ proclaimed, it can be argued that the Evangelist intentionally began and ended his introduction with reference to euangelion. Through this procedure the Evangelist defined the good news as that which leads through John the Baptist to Jesus Christ, and also as that which Jesus proclaimed.

---

[1] Schweizer, "Contribution," pp. 431-32; "Leistung," p. 355.

[2] Schweizer, "Contribution," p. 421.

[3] L. E. Keck, "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology," _The Journal of Biblical Literature_, LXXXIV (1965), 341-58; "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel," _New Testament Studies_, XII (1966), 352-70.

When it is clear that 1:14-15 is the concluding summary of the introduction, then the first section of the Marcan Gospel proper begins with 1:16 and ends with a summary in 3:7-12. Now the first basic section of Mark begins with Jesus' calling of four disciples, Simon and Andrew, and James and John. Then, at the end of the section in 3:7-12, the previous material is summarized by the Evangelist in a general statement that Jesus "had healed many . . . and whenever the unclean spirits beheld him, they fell down before him and cried out, 'You are the Son of God.'" Hence 3:13-19 begins another section as Jesus calls the twelve disciples. This is ended in 6:1-7a in a summary of Jesus' ministry in his own country: "And he could do no mighty work there, except that he laid his hands upon a few sick people and healed them . . ." Again a new section begins with an extended statement about Jesus' calling of his disciples. This time, in 6:7b-13, Jesus calls the Twelve to go out and do that which he himself has done in the preceding two sections. Thus each section is introduced by discipleship material.[1]

---

[1] Keck, "Introduction," pp. 353-58.

While the exact format of the sections changes in the second half of the Gospel, still the emphasis remains the same: the call to discipleship is at the center. After 8:31-32a Peter rebukes Jesus, then Jesus calls the disciples to follow with their own crosses (8:34); after 9:31, when the disciples again do not understand, Jesus corrects them by emphasizing what real following after him means; then after 10:32, when still a misunderstanding is present, Jesus calls the disciples to be servants as he himself came to serve.[2]

Thus, in the first part of the Marcan Gospel, each section is introduced by discipleship material; in the second half of the Gospel, discipleship material is at the center of the presentation in answer to the misunderstandings which occur. Hence, heeding "Schweizer's implied demand that the structure be related to Mark's central concern,"[3] Keck argues that a basic part of the Marcan presentation is the steady emphasis on the disciples' participation in the work of Jesus. There is no strictly Christological aim (in the narrow sense of doctrine about the person of Christ) in Mark, but "Jesus is good news because as the Son of God he calls men to follow him with their crosses."[4] Therefore, on the basis of an examination of the structure of the Gospel of Mark, Keck makes this statement about the Marcan presentation:

> The "career" of Jesus as Mark tells it not only uses the relation of Jesus to the disciples as structural turning

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 362-64; cf. Keck, "Mark 3:7-12," pp. 342-45.

[2] Keck, "Introduction," p. 363.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 356. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 364.

> points within the whole narrative but the narrative itself begins and ends with precisely this note of participating in Jesus' life and death.[1]

Setting the Problem for Investigating the Marcan Christology

The result of Schweizer's and Keck's work is to place before us the task of understanding the Marcan proclamation in relation to the structure of the entire Gospel narrative. This task, linked with the view of the Gospel as primarily intended to proclaim the kerygma, provides the context for our investigation of the Christology of Mark.

Keck's well-supported disagreement with Schweizer, however, simply establishes a dialogue which, so far, is unresolved. This dialogue is based upon a disagreement whether the impetus of the narrative lies in summaries of Jesus' activities or in Jesus' constant call to disciples. Schweizer insists that each new section begins with a summary of Jesus' activities, while Keck maintains that each new section begins with an episode of Jesus calling men to discipleship. This dialogue will not be resolved until the underlying reason for Keck's disagreement with Schweizer is clarified.

Keck has taken a significant step forward when he suggests that the structure of the narrative derives from the Evangelist's intention to portray Jesus' call to discipleship. Now the basis for determining the turning points in the narrative is the Evangelist's arrangement and composition of materials to portray Jesus' activity in such a way that it describes the essential function of the risen Lord in the later Christian community. His function, according to Keck, is to call men to follow him in the way of suffering and death so that they may receive the salvation which God has prepared for them. This step forward by Keck is decisive for understanding the structure of the Marcan narrative.

---

[1] *Ibid.*

Schweizer has interpreted Mark from its proclamation of the risen Lord in the later community, but his interpretation in the structure of the narrative is still based upon the outline of the Gospel which developed out of an earlier assessment of the Gospels as historical. The outline of the Gospel which Schweizer uses for his discussion of the Marcan structure is basically the one followed by V. Taylor in his commentary on Mark (there is one variation; Taylor breaks the narrative at 6:13, Schweizer at 6:6). This division of the Gospel has developed throughout the last three-fourths of a century and has been motivated by the view that "the Gospel . . . is something more than one of the popular cultbooks of primitive Christianity. It is . . . an attempt to tell how the Good News concerning Jesus Christ, the Son of God, began, and thus to serve historical as well as religious ends."[1] Because interpreters have stressed that the Gospel served "historical" as well as "religious" ends, the divisions of the Gospel center around important "historical" occurrences. Thus, important divisions of the Gospel occur when Jesus begins his Galilean ministry, flees from the crowds and begins to teach, decides to perform a ministry beyond Galilee, starts to teach his disciples who he really is, etc. Even though Schweizer's general approach is that the Gospel is designed to proclaim the Good News, when his interpretation of the structure of the Gospel is based upon that previously established outline, he views the structure from the summaries of Jesus' activities within the historical episodes through which he moves.

---

[1] V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (2d ed.; London: Macmillan and Co., 1965), p. 105.

In contrast, Keck has attempted to remain consistent in his interpretation of the Gospel and his definition of its structure. There are, however, two problems with Keck's results. First of all, he maintains that Jesus' primary function in the narrative is "calling men to discipleship." While this theme is of utmost importance, the material which the Evangelist has selected to depict Jesus' ministry indicates that Jesus' function is much more than this. It is also to heal, to forgive sins, and to judge men's actions. We must attempt to discover if the structure indicates how the Evangelist correlates these functions with his function of calling to discipleship. Secondly, the structural pattern which is suggested by Keck applies only to the first half of the narrative (so did Schweizer's). Thereafter the structure is different, but the narrative is still focused (according to Keck) upon the same theme. This presents a significant problem. On the one hand, this analysis doesn't comply with what is generally recognized about the Evangelist's redactional activity. The beginning section in the second half of the Gospel (8:27-10:45) is noted as an expanse of the narrative where the Evangelist's hand is most prominent.[1] Therefore, to suggest that the structural turning point for this section is quite different from that of the previous sections introduces a very dubious understanding of the Evangelist's activity in structuring the narrative. On the other hand, this view simply fits into the inability, in Marcan research, to reconcile the first half of the Gospel with the second half. All too often the problem with the interpretations of the Marcan narrative has stemmed from an overemphasis on the importance of the first half of the narrative, or an overestimation of the prominence of the last half of the narrative.

---

[1] See, e.g., Tödt, Son of Man, pp. 145-47.

The beginning point for understanding the structure of the Marcan narrative must be a recognition that this Gospel represents a pre-fixing of narrative material portraying the ministry of Jesus onto the passion narrative tradition which had existed for some time in early Christianity.[1] As Marxsen has demonstrated,[2] the Marcan narrative reflects an extension of the passion kerygma "backwards" to include the ministry of Jesus. Consequently, we must find that structure within the narrative which leads all the way up to the passion narrative. Only this understanding of the structure can lead us to the motivation behind the extension of the scope of the traditional extant narrative.

As a by-product of their efforts, Schweizer and Keck have opened the way for demonstrating the locus of the structure of the narrative up to the passion narrative. Their work, when studied side by side, leads one to turning points in the narrative which are designed primarily to characterize Jesus according to a Christological function and title which is important for the later community. An episode of this type stands as a structural turning point for each section of the narrative prior to the passion narrative. These turning points are the means by which the narrative about the ministry of Jesus is integrated with the passion narrative. The episodes also, as a result, contribute to the overall portrayal of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as he is envisioned by the Evangelist to be important for the later Christian community.

---

[1] This was clear as early as Martin Kähler, The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic, Biblical Christ, trans. and ed. by Carl E. Braaten, Seminar Editions (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 80, and has been further substantiated since. See Dibelius, Tradition, pp. 178-217; Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, pp. 275-77; and J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, trans. by N. Perrin (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), pp. 89-96.

[2] Marxsen, Markus, esp. pp. 17-26.

Hence, the investigation of the Christology of Mark brings one to an analysis of the structure of the Marcan narrative. When the Christological reflection in the turning points of the narrative is investigated, further data become available for assessing the Christological unity perceived by the Evangelist who constructed the Gospel. If an investigation of the Christology of Mark draws us nearer to understanding the unity which the Evangelist intended for his work, this can aid us in understanding the impulse which brought about the creation of the Gospel form and, along with it, the Gospel of Mark.

CHAPTER II

CHRISTOLOGY AND NARRATIVE STRUCTURE IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

Introduction

The preceding part has indicated that an investigation of the Christological emphases in Mark must be carried out in direct relation to the structure and meaning of the entire Marcan Gospel. Further, the task is to discover the particular Christological view presented by the Evangelist through the selection, arrangement, and composition of the material. Hence, it is necessary, on the one hand, to seek out those places in the Gospel where the editorial activity of the Evangelist is most evident, and, on the other hand, it is important to ascertain divisions or sections within the narrative which indicate new directions for the narrative. It is our purpose to bring these two aspects of the study of the Gospel together in this inquiry into the Christology of Mark.

One of the most evident places of individual work by the Evangelist is found in units which give general summaries of activities already portrayed in specific episodes. These had been noticed by scholars but were not investigated extensively for insight into the final Gospel production until K. L. Schmidt's study, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, in 1919.[1] In this study, Schmidt examined all of the interconnecting links in the Gospel and, in the process, distinguished entire summary units formulated by the Evangelist which he called _Sammelberichte_. In Mark he found _Sammelberichte_ at 1:14-15, 21-22, 39; 2:13; 3:7-12; 5:21; 6:6b, 12-13, 30-33, 53-56; 10:1.[1] In these particular verses in the narrative, therefore, is to be found some of the most evident selection, arrangement, and composition of material by the Evangelist.

---

[1] Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung (Repr. ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964).

On the other end of our spectrum lies the division of the narrative into basic divisions of the Gospel; the precise beginning and ending of these sections has varied for important reasons which we shall discuss later. The outline shown by V. Taylor in his commentary on Mark can be taken as representative: 1:1-13 is the introduction to the Gospel; 1:14-3:6 gives an account of the Galilean ministry; 3:7-6:13 relates the height of the Galilean ministry; 6:14-8:26 represents the ministry beyond Galilee; 8:27-10:52 includes Caesarea Philippi and the journey to Jerusalem; 11:1-13:37 contains the ministry in Jerusalem; 14:1-16:8 depicts the passion and resurrection.[2]

It is now important to notice that, according to this outline of the Gospel, two of the _Sammelberichte_ isolated by Schmidt occur at the beginning of new sections (1:14-15; 3:7-12) and one occurs at the end of a section (6:12-13). This would indicate that some of the most apparent editorial and compositional work of the Evangelist has occurred at places where a significant shift in the narrative is intended.

Of further interest for our Christological inquiry are suggestions that important theological and Christological affirmations are fused within the first two of these summary reports: 1:14-15 and 3:7-12. E. Lohmeyer, R. H. Lightfoot, and W. Marxsen pointed to the theological and Christological importance of Jesus' ministry in Galilee and its summary formulation in 1:14-15.[1] Then, more recently, E. Schweizer and L. E. Keck have pointed to the importance of 3:7-12 for the theological and Christological impact which it has upon the narrative.[2] These Christological affirmations within summaries formulated by the Evangelist at the beginning of a new section in the narrative are of primary importance for our study of the Christology of Mark. It suggests that the Evangelist has intended a structure within his narrative which highlights certain aspects of Jesus' activity by placing a carefully composed or edited unit at a point where one section ends and a new one begins. Further it presents the possibility that the Evangelist has shown his own Christological affirmations most clearly in these units. This possibility is strengthened to a likelihood when one turns to those places which scholars have indicated as junctures in the narrative and discovers at each of these an important Christological affirmation. The units which stand at these junctures and assert important Christological affirmations are 1:14-15; 3:7-12; 6:1-6; 8:27-33; 10:46-52; 13:1-37. One or more Christological titles occur in five of these six units, and in three of these a title is introduced into the narrative for the first time (6:1-6--prophet; 8:27-33--Messiah; 10:46-52--Son of David). 1:14-15 asserts that Jesus' ministry takes place in Galilee and that it participates in the fulfillment of the time and the nearness of the kingdom of God; 3:7-12 proclaims that Jesus is the Son of God who has authority to cast out demons; 6:1-6 announces that Jesus is a rejected prophet; 8:27-33 declares that Jesus is a suffering Messiah most properly designated Son of man; 10:46-52 portrays Jesus as the Son of David; and 13:1-37 promises Jesus as the coming Son of man. The particular importance of these Christological affirmations can only be judged on the basis of their place and function in the entire narrative, but their importance in the Christological assertion of the Gospel is surely not to be denied.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 320.

[2] Taylor, _Mark_, pp. 107-11.

---

[1] Ernst Lohmeyer, Galiläa und Jerusalem, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Heft 34 [New Series] (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1936), pp. 29-30; R. H. Lightfoot, Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937), pp. 114-16, 156; Marxsen, Markus, pp. 35-41, 88-90.

[2] Schweizer, "Leistung," p. 344; Evangelium, p. 43; Keck, "Mark 3:7-12," pp. 344-45, 352-54.

With this insight comes a further assertion as to the place of these units in the narrative. In the history of scholarly discussion of these units, there has been disagreement whether four of these six units (1:14-15; 3:7-12; 6:1-6; 10:46-52) begin or end a section of the Gospel. One of the results of an awareness of the Christological affirmation in them is to suggest that all six units are best described as transitional units within the narrative. That is to suggest that they are designed neither to end the previous section nor begin an entirely new section but to stand in between two sections as a transitional, pivotal point in the narrative. As such, however, they do not stand outside either the preceding section or the succeeding section but within both of them. Thus the investigation of one of the sections in the Gospel must not overlook either the transitional unit which stands at the beginning of it or the one which stands at the end of it. Conversely, the investigation of a transitional unit must include an analysis of the section preceding it and the section following it.

We will investigate two of these paragraphs at a time: (a) 1:14-15 and 3:7-12; (b) 6:1-6 and 8:27-33; (c) 10:46-52 and 13:1-37. In this way the Christological movement of the narrative can be more clearly discussed. First of all, the transitional character of each of the two paragraphs will be discussed in relation to the redactional activity in each one. Secondly, each paragraph will be examined for its Christological import in that section of the Gospel. Thirdly, the material between these transitional units will be analyzed to further define the Christological movement of the Gospel narrative.

Mark 1:14-15 and 3:7-12

We will begin our discussion with the first two transitional units in the Marcan narrative: 1:14-15 and 3:7-12. The investigation of these two units brings 1:1-5:43 of the Marcan narrative into consideration, because, as pointed out above, each transitional unit throughout the Gospel is related to the section before it and the section after it, i.e. is interrelated with the material extending to the next transitional unit in either direction. In this expanse of the narrative the authority and power of Jesus' ministry grows until a point where the Evangelist proclaims that Jesus is able to raise a girl from death to life (5:21-24, 35-43). This power and authority comprises the basic Christological characterization of Jesus in this part of the Marcan narrative, and the Evangelist correlates this activity with the title Son of God. The rejection of Jesus is also evident in this material, but this theme is not fused within the Christological characterization of Jesus until the transitional unit 6:1-6, where the title "prophet" is introduced for that purpose.

Mark 1:14-15

Our discussion begins with the transitional unit in 1:14-15:

> [14]Now after John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, [15]and saying, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel."

This paragraph functions as a transition: it is a pivotal unit which interconnects the preceding with the succeeding narrative. The basic pivotal feature of the unit resides in the contrasts it draws between John the Baptist and Jesus. The paramount theme in this contrast is the relation of Jesus to preaching and the gospel. This aspect of the unit is sketched through five components: (a) John the Baptist's ministry is in the wilderness--Jesus' ministry is in Galilee; (b) the Baptist is "delivered up" at the end of his ministry--Jesus is thus foreshadowed as being "delivered up" at the end of his ministry: (c) the Baptist preaches a baptism--Jesus preaches the gospel of God; (d) the Baptist preaches, "After me comes he who is mightier than I, the thong of whose sandals I am not worthy to stoop down and untie"--Jesus says, "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand"; (e) the Baptist preaches a repentance; Jesus preaches repentance and belief in the gospel. Through these five elements the Evangelist has reached back into the themes in 1:1-13 and reworked them in connection with the material which stands in 1:16-3:6. As he has formed and fashioned these themes, the Evangelist has offered a beginning Christological characterization of Jesus and his ministry. In the next transitional unit, 3:7-12, this characterization of Jesus reaches a climactic point in the testimony that Jesus functions as Son of God. Thus, when Jesus' ministry in Galilee brings to him followers from many regions all over the countryside, Jesus is designated by a title which names him in his healing function. The relationship of 1:14-15 and 3:7-12 in the Christological movement of the narrative will be treated in detail later; we must first analyze the transitional character of 1:14-15.

The transitional character of Mark 1:14-15 becomes evident when one examines the past scholarly discussion of this passage: some scholars considered these verses to be part of the Marcan introduction while others have regarded them as the opening to Jesus' ministry. On the one hand, scholars have considered the introduction to the Gospel to include only 1:1-13. The prominent reason for this division is that vss. 14-15 are viewed as the verses which introduce the Galilean ministry of Jesus. In 1850 A. Hilgenfeld commented upon 1:14-15 in these terms: "Nach diesen kurzen Vorbereitungen [1:1-13] geht der kanonische Markus schon 1.14, 15 zu dem eigentlichen Kern der evangelischen Geschichte, der Wirksamkeit Jesu in Galiläa über."[1] Many scholars after 1850 considered 1:1-13 to be the "preparatory statements" to the Gospel of Mark; thus they viewed vss. 14-15 as introducing Jesus' ministry in Galilee which continues up to 6:13 (5:43 for some). Probably the strongest assertion of this division has come from R. H. Lightfoot in his Bampton lectures of 1934[2] and his further development of this position in The Gospel Message of St. Mark[3] published in 1950. He considered it necessary to argue that the introduction continued through 1:13, since the Westcott-Hort text left a major gap between 1:8 and 1:9 to indicate a basic juncture in the Marcan presentation. Others have simply worked with 1:1-13 as the introduction without considering it necessary to argue for this extent of the introduction because vs. 14 begins the traditional Galilean ministry of Jesus.[1]

---

[1] Das Markusevangelium, nach seiner Composition, seiner Stellung in der Evangelien-Literatur, seinem Ursprung und Charakter (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1850), p. 6.

[2] History and Interpretation in the Gospels, The Bampton Lectures (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934), pp. 61-62.

[3] Oxford Paperbacks, No. 41 (Oxford: University Press, 1962), pp. 15-20.

On the other hand, however, there were some scholars who considered 1:1-15 to be the introduction to the Gospel of Mark. J. Wellhausen regarded the introduction to Mark as continuing through 1:15, and the first section which extended from 1:16-6:13 he called "Jesus in Kapernaum."[2] In his first edition of his commentary on Mark in 1907, E. Klostermann treated 1:1-15 as the introduction to the Gospel,[3] but by the fourth edition of his commentary he had changed to 1:1-13.[4] Zahn regarded 1:1-15 as the prologue to Mark and supported this division with these comments:

> This sentence [1:14-15], which gives an outline view of Jesus' entire ministry, is in keeping with the title of the book, . . . in comparison with similar passages in the other Gospels, Mark's use of the word [euangelion] in his description of Jesus' life-work [vs. 14] and in the summary which he gives of the essential

---

[1] B. W. Bacon, The Beginnings of Gospel Story (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1909); Th. Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, trans. by M. W. Jacobus and others (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1909); Maurice Goguel, L'Evangile de Marc, Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des hautes études. Sciences religieuses, Vol. XXII (Paris: E. Leroux, 1909), and many others. C. H. Turner assumed this to be a strong enough beginning to argue for the meta, "Text of Mark I," Journal of Theological Studies, XXVIII (1927), 150-58.

[2] Das Evangelium Marci (2d ed.; Berlin: G. Reimer, 1909), pp. 7-9.

[3] Das Markusevangelium, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1907).

[4] Ibid. (4th ed.; 1950).

> contents of Jesus' preaching [vs. 15], also the comparatively frequent recurrence of the word in the further course of this Gospel, all go to prove that in using it Mark had in mind always the purpose of the book indicated in its title.[1]

Thus it is clear that the nature of vss. 14-15 in Mark has in the past led to a disagreement over their relation to the preceding thirteen verses and to the succeeding verses which tell of Jesus' ministry.

Recently the discussion of the length of the Marcan introduction has been reopened and the past disagreement over the function of these verses has become relevant. In 1958 A. Kuby discussed the Gospel from the view that 1:1-15 represented the introduction to it;[2] in 1963-64 O. J. F. Seitz questioned the view that Mark 1:1-13 represented the Marcan introduction;[3] and in 1965-66 L. E. Keck argued strongly for the position that 1:1-15 is the introduction to the Gospel of Mark.[4] Then, as was already noted above,[5] Keck proposed that Mark 1:14-15 is the conclusion to the introduction. He cited the ways in which Lightfoot's comparison of the Marcan introduction with the prologue of the fourth Gospel led Lightfoot to a conclusion about the extent of the Marcan introduction that can be disputed.[6] Then, as was also noted,[7] by appealing to W. Marxsen's work, he asserted the importance of _euangelion_ in the Gospel of Mark and drew attention to the fact that in 1:1 and 1:14-15 the word euangelion occurs three times, then is absent from the narrative until 8:35. As he said, "euangelion is clearly the rubric under which Mark wants to place his material."[1] For this reason, 1:14-15 must be seen to be integrally related to the preceding material which begins in 1:1. In 1:1 the phrase "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ . . ." does not make clear whether Iēsou Christou is a subjective genitive or an objective genitive. Vss. 14-15, standing at the end of the introduction, fill out the meaning of the first occurrence of euangelion: the gospel is about Jesus Christ and is also the God-given gospel which Jesus preached, and even more than this, the gospel Jesus preaches is not separated from the gospel which the Church preaches, and it is the object of faith in the Evangelist's Church.[2]

---

[1] Zahn, _Introduction_, II, 460-61.

[2] "Zur Konzeption des Markusevangeliums," _Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft_, XLIX (1958), 54-55, n. 8.

[3] "_Praeparatio Evangelica_ in the Markan Prologue," _Journal of Biblical Literature_, LXXXII (1963), 201-06; "Gospel Prologues: A Common Pattern?", _Journal of Biblical Literature_, LXXXIII (1964), 262-68.

[4] Keck, "Mark 3.7-12," pp. 341-58; "Introduction," pp. 352-70.

[5] Above, pp. 48-49. [6] Keck, "Introduction," pp. 353-54.

[7] Above, p. 49.

Keck made a legitimate point: 1:14-15 is integrally related to the preceding material and fills out what was begun in 1:1. But Keck's further drawing out of his thesis does not seem entirely satisfactory. First of all, he states that for the Marcan Evangelist "the gospel 'begins' when Jesus begins preaching."[3] But, as Robinson has pointed out, the remarkable thing about the Marcan Gospel is that the ministry of Jesus is presented after a discussion of the role of John the Baptist, yet the "beginning of the good news about Jesus Christ" includes the ministry of John.[4] Perhaps, then, vss. 1-13 are not to be set off as a preliminary introduction but in fact represent an essential insight of the Evangelist into the "good news." Secondly, Keck noticed that each new section begins with discipleship material and 1:16-20 (the calling of Simon and Andrew, James and John) "stands as the paradigmatic inauguration of the whole."[1] Keck is surely right to assert on this basis that for Mark "it is clear that 'believing the gospel' means heeding Jesus' call to follow,"[2] but, as already noted above,[3] to describe the Gospel of Mark almost entirely as a "discipleship" document is to do an injustice to other very important features of that Gospel.

---

[1] Keck, "Introduction," p. 359. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

[4] Robinson, Problem, p. 23.

While the introduction is not complete without vss. 14-15, neither is the following section complete without these verses. The latter is evident precisely because in vs. 16 the Evangelist does not introduce the one who is walking by the Sea of Galilee; it is only in vs. 17 that we indirectly find out that it is Jesus who is walking there. Vss. 14-15 introduced Jesus into his ministry, and 1:16-20 is the first episode of that ministry. But, on the other hand, 1:14-15 is integrally related back to 1:1 in which the Evangelist made his first statement about euangelion. Thus in vss. 14-15 we have a transitional unit in which the Evangelist sums up the preceding section in the same verses in which he inaugurates the ministry of the main character in his narrative, Jesus. In 1867 A. Klostermann grappled with this double aspect of 1:14-15 in a most revealing way: when he discussed the introduction he included vss. 1-14,[4] and his discussion of the first main section of the Gospel started with 1:14.[1] He properly saw the way in which 1:14 related back to the Baptist and his ministry, yet he also knew that vss. 14-15 introduced the ministry of Jesus. This same kind of insight led H. J. Holtzmann to describe the introduction as ending with 1:15, yet to call 1:14-15 the "superscription" to the Galilean ministry.[2] Interestingly enough, Wendling never committed himself to the actual extent of the prologue but considered 1:14b-15 to be redactional work of the Evangelist in the transition from the prologue about the Baptist to the Capernaum story.[3] Likewise, in recent years, although both J. M. Robinson and W. Grundmann have considered the introduction to consist of 1:1-13, their discussion of vss. 14-15 has supported a view of them as transitional: Robinson said that "v. 14 provides a formal termination to John's ministry and a formal introduction to Jesus' ministry,"[4] and Grundmann has called vs. 14 a "contrasting parallel" between Jesus' preaching and John's.[5]

---

[1] Keck, "Introduction," p. 363. [2] Ibid., p. 368. [3] Above, p. 53.

[4] Das Markus-Evangelium (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1867), pp. 56, 22-23.

The past discussion of vss. 14-15 supports an understanding of them as transitional in the Gospel, but to understand the particular meaning of the transition we must inquire into the formation of these verses. How, we must ask, has the Evangelist built up this unit? He begins the statement with *meta de to paradothēnai ton Iōannēn ēlthen ho Iēsous eis tēn Galilaian*. From the evidence in Acts 1:22; 10:36-37 (cf. 13:24-25; 19:3-4); Matt. 11:2-19, it becomes apparent that the connection and comparison of Jesus with John the Baptist had theological importance in early Christianity.[1] The points of comparison seem to have varied at different times and places in the early Church. The references in Acts are especially difficult to assess in relation to the Gospel of Mark, because Luke-Acts has been shown to have a special interest in the scheme of salvation history[2] and the author of Luke-Acts had direct knowledge of the Gospel of Mark. Nevertheless, the particular formulation of these statements reveals to us the difference between the general formulation and the particular comparison which the Marcan Evangelist has developed. In every instance in Acts the comparison of Jesus with John centers upon baptism: Acts 1:21-22, "during all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John until the day when he was taken up from us"; Acts 10:36-37, ". . . preaching good news of peace by Jesus Christ . . . beginning from Galilee after the baptism which John preached"; Acts 13:24-25, "Before his coming John had preached a baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel. And as John was finishing his course, he said, 'What do you suppose that I am? I am not he. No, but after me one is coming, the sandals of whose feet I am not worthy to untie.'"; Acts 19:3-4, ". . . John baptized with the baptism of repentance, telling the people that they should believe in the one who was to come after him, that is, in Jesus." As the Marcan Evangelist began his Gospel he included a discussion of John the Baptist and his baptism of Jesus; the traditions in Acts suggest that this was an important matter in the churches. From at least one tradition in Q (Matt. 11:16-19 par.), it is evident that the ministry of the Baptist was at times compared with the ministry of Jesus, especially with regard to the ascetic quality of the activities in each. Also, this tradition indicates that some attention was focused upon the negative response which these ministries elicited from "this evil generation."

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 23-25, 35.

[2] H. J. Holtzmann, *Die Synoptiker*, Hand-kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Bd. I. 1 (3d ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1901), pp. 11, 115. He thought vs. 14a was originally an introduction to vss. 16-20 which the Evangelist moved back to conclude the prologue. While it concluded the prologue, however, it retained its status as an introduction to the Galilean ministry.

[3] Emil Wendling, *Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1908), pp. 2-3. Keck regarded Wendling as having supported 1:1-15 as the Marcan introduction, probably because Wendling considered vs. 14a to be the concluding part of an earlier tradition extending from 1:4-14a. But Wendling calls 1:14b, 15 an *Übergang*.

[4] Robinson, *Problem*, p. 22.

[5] "*Eine kontrastreiche Parallelität*"; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, Vol. II (Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1968), p. 36.

---

[1] Robinson, *Problem*, p. 22; C. H. H. Scobie, *John the Baptist* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), pp. 15-16.

[2] Conzelmann, *St. Luke*.

In addition to these two ways of interrelating their ministries, Mark 1:14 sets up a comparison between John and Jesus on the basis of "being delivered up." It is instructive that in no other place in the New Testament tradition independent from this verse is the statement made that John the Baptist was "delivered up" (paradothēnai).[1] Furthermore, as Marxsen has shown, this use of paradidōmi as an absolute stands only in connection with Jesus and his passion except for this one place; in all other instances a person is delivered over to someone.[2] Hence the "delivering up" of the Baptist refers not only to his imprisonment by Herod, but in this statement he is the forerunner of Jesus in the theological meaning of sharing the fate of his passion. This use of paradothēnai with John the Baptist is not for the establishment of chronology,[1] but is a statement of John's forerunning place theologically to Jesus' passion. The Evangelist's connection of the Baptist's "being delivered up" and Jesus' ministry is a statement about the relationship of John and Jesus theologically and even Christologically. Jesus is the one who "was delivered up" (I Cor. 11:23), but John's ministry is a corresponding and forecasting statement about Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. To this extent John is the forerunner of Jesus, but this term "forerunner" must be used with great reserve as a description of the relation of John to Jesus in this Gospel. The clause *meta de paradothēnai ton Iōannēn* is one of the clearest examples of the intersection of the two lines of direction which Marxsen has described within the Gospel of Mark:[2] on the one hand, the Evangelist expands his Gospel backwards from the passion kerygma so that the statement that the Baptist "is delivered up" is a statement deriving from the passion where the Son of man is delivered up; but, on the other hand, the story is told in the form of a sequence of episodes so that Jesus' ministry begins after the Baptist's "being delivered up." It is in this way that the Evangelist makes his statement in a story that has a sequence of episodes, yet for him the sequences present theological statements about the people and problems involved rather than chronological stages in a carefully worked out scheme of salvation history.

---

[1] The Matthean Evangelist, in 4:12, follows the Marcan use of paradidōmi with the Baptist, but the Lucan Evangelist, in 4:14-15, omits it.

[2] Marxsen, Markus, p. 23, n. 1.

In this first clause, therefore, the Evangelist has set up an important theological relation between the work of the Baptist and Jesus. The theological formulation imbeds Jesus' work directly within the framework of the Jewish scriptures and Jewish hopes: the scriptures and even a man with a voice crying out to the Jews has prepared the way and the fate of his work. But the transference of the fate of Jesus' passion upon the Baptist takes a step beyond this more general theological interpretation of Jesus' work--it is based upon an embryonic form of Christological interpretation of Jesus' passion (i.e. Christ's "having been delivered up" points to his essential function in the Marcan Evangelist's Church where the believers are being "delivered up" to councils for persecution [Mark 13:9, 11, 12]). The Baptist thus becomes the forerunner to Jesus' Christological function in the passion when his work is interconnected with Jesus' work through "having been delivered up."

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 23, n. 5. It is a matter of "unchronological chronology"; cf. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen*, p. 34, it is "ein heilsgeschicht leiher Schematismus"; J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903), pp. 136-38.

[2] Marxsen, *Introduction*, pp. 134-35.

In addition to the use of paradothēnai to interconnect the work of the Baptist and Jesus, the entire remaining parts of vss. 14-15 are formed in the interest of paralleling and contrasting Jesus' ministry to the Baptist's. The comparison for the purpose of transition to Jesus' work highlights four themes: (a) John was "in the wilderness," Jesus came "into Galilee"; (b) John preached "a baptism," Jesus preached "the gospel of God"; (c) John preached, saying, "After me comes he who is mightier than I, the thong of whose sandals I am not worthy to stoop down and untie," Jesus said, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand"; (d) John preached a baptism "of repentance for the forgiveness of sins," Jesus said, "repent and believe in the gospel."

First of all, the Baptist was en tē erēmō (vs. 4) and Jesus came eis tēn Galilaian (vs. 14). As a number of scholars have shown,[1] and Marxsen especially well, the conception of both the wilderness and Galilee is theologically oriented: the wilderness is connected with the Baptist because this is the "place" for the crying voice as it is fulfilled from Old Testament passages,[2] and Jesus' ministry "in Galilee" is theologically understood by the Evangelist as ministry in the place of the gospel's eschatological fulfillment.[3] This general and theologically oriented statement in vs. 14 that Jesus "came into Galilee" is important to portray the necessary connection and contrast between Jesus and the Baptist.

Secondly, John preached "a baptism," Jesus preached "the gospel of God." The Baptist and Jesus both preach, and in this they have an essential relationship to each other. But John preaches a baptism; Jesus asks the disciples if they are able to accept the baptism with which he is baptized (10:38-39), but never in Mark does Jesus baptize or give his disciples authority to baptize. The central element in the preaching of the Baptist is baptism; in contrast, Jesus' preaching contains, as its nucleus, the gospel of God.

Thirdly, the Baptist said that one who was mightier than he would come after him, and in vs. 14 Jesus "came" and said, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." In this again we see a definitive characterization of Jesus through a comparison with the Baptist. In Mark the Baptist doesn't preach about the kingdom--he baptizes and tells about a mightier one who is coming. The transition presents the Jesus who participates in the fulfilled time and the coming of the kingdom of God.

---

[1] Lohmeyer, Galiläa, pp. 26, 30; Schmidt, Der Rahmen, pp. 33-34; Marxsen, Markus, pp. 35-36.

[2] Marxsen, Markus, pp. 33-77.

[3] Lohmeyer, Galiläa, p. 29; Lightfoot, Locality, pp. 62-65, 111; cf. S. G. F. Brandon, Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church (Naperville: Allenson, 1957), p. 197.

Fourthly, vss. 14-15 finally reach the climactic statement of the transition from the Baptist to Jesus. The Baptist preached a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins; Jesus preaches what the early Church preaches: "repent and believe in the gospel." In this statement the characterization reaches its highest point of contrast: throughout the entire comparison the Baptist has had nothing to do with the gospel, the kingdom of God, or Galilee; now Jesus, who preaches the gospel of God in Galilee and participates in the kingdom of God, preaches belief in the gospel which includes belief in himself (as has been made clear in vs. 1). In this verse the transition has come full circle: the Baptist was concerned with repentance for the forgiveness of sins, and Jesus preaches repentance and belief in the gospel.

The further significance of this transitional unit must now be brought out by an investigation of the function of this unit in the Christological movement of the first part of the narrative. The Evangelist has first of all set at the head of his work "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God."[1] Whether archē means

---

[1] C. H. Turner and V. Taylor have argued strongly for the inclusion of huiou theou in Mark 1:1 on the basis of: (a) at least as strong or stronger attestation (against Tischendorf and Westcott-Hort); (b) its likely omission by homoioteleuton; (c) its natural correspondence with the contents of the Gospel. See Turner, "Mark I," p. 150; Taylor, Mark, p. 152.

"the beginning" or "first things" (essentials),[1] the title "Jesus Christ" would be a proper name for the Greek-speaking Evangelist.[2] This title would undoubtedly designate generally the one in whom the saving events, death and resurrection, took place, and would indicate the object of faith and the content of preaching.[3] While the exact phrase "the gospel of Jesus Christ" does not occur anywhere else in the New Testament writings, the phrase "the gospel of Christ" was most likely firm in general Christian tradition alongside of statements about the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ as saving events.[4] Actually, "the gospel" would in itself refer to belief in the death and resurrection as saving events, and "of Jesus Christ" would stand as an objective genitive which defined the content of the gospel. Perhaps the addition of "Jesus" to this opening phrase is a formulation the Evangelist preferred for a clearer designation at the beginning of his writing.[5] If the occurrence of "Son of God" is original in 1:1,[6] then the Evangelist has surely placed alongside the more traditional formulation his own preferred designation for Jesus in gospel proclamation.[1]

---

[1] A. Wikgren, "ARCHĒ TOU EUANGELIOU," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXI (1942), 11-29.

[2] Werner Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, trans. by Brian Hardy, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 50 (London: S. C. M. Press, 1966), p. 40, #8b; Taylor, Mark, p. 152.

[3] Kramer, Christ, Lord, p. 202, #59e.

[4] Ibid., p. 52, #12c.

[5] In parallel fashion, Paul appears to have used the double title more often at the beginning or ending of his epistles than in the documents themselves, perhaps indicating a more formal and complete designation; ibid., p. 202, #59d.

[6] Above, p. 73, n. 1.

These matters are noticed here to bring attention that the first verse of the Gospel (except for arche) probably represents a traditional confessional formulation in Christian circles at the time of the writing of this Gospel. A peculiarly Marcan element may be that this document proposes to start at the "beginning" of the gospel of Jesus Christ or to proclaim the "essentials" of that gospel. It is for this reason that 1:14-15 is such a significant unit in this Gospel. After some important definitions and essential characterizations have been given in 1:1-13, these next two verses rework the traditional formulation in vs. 1 into its particular Marcan emphasis. The first conspicuous aspect of this reformulation is that this Gospel of Jesus Christ begins to recount that Jesus preached the "gospel of God" and said, "repent and believe in the gospel." Jesus is portrayed as doing exactly what the apostles do, but the remarkable part of it is that this probably reverses the traditional uses of "gospel of Christ" and "gospel of God." In traditional circles the "gospel of God" was the more inclusive term which could designate that the gospel belongs to God or that God is the source of the gospel (subj. gen.),[2] while "the gospel of Christ" was the more particular term which specified the content of the gospel. In Mark the inclusive term is "the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God" and part of this gospel is that Jesus preached the gospel of God and said, "repent and believe in the gospel." Now the tables are turned: the "preaching the gospel of God" is a Christological formulation which gives authorization and power to the activity of Jesus in his ministry.[1] This formulation of the "gospel of Jesus Christ" now designates Jesus' activity during his earthly ministry as also part of the saving events, i.e. the essential proclamation and manifestation of the "gospel of God." Also, the points of comparison and contrast between the Baptist and Jesus in this transitional reformulation of the term gospel presents a decisive context for the ministry of Jesus. The eschatological setting of Jesus' ministry in Galilee within the fulfilled time when the kingdom of God is at hand places a Christological stamp upon these activities as being in an essential relationship with God's activity and rule. The way in which the Baptist's ministry contrasts with this authority and yet prepares and foreshadows it in the fulfillment of scripture and anticipation of Jesus' fate in the passion sets a context of themes and emphases which are the mortar and brick out of which the Marcan Evangelist built his entire narrative.

---

[1] The connection of Jesus Christ and Son of God occurs once in Paul, in II Cor. 1:19. These titles have come from different spheres, and even in Paul's writings have been kept separate except for this one instance and in Rom. 1:9, where instead of formulating the usual "gospel of Christ" Paul used "the gospel of his Son."

[2] Subj. gen. best applies to the Pauline usages while obj. gen. explains Mark 1:1; F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, trans. by R. W. Funk (2d ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 90, #163; Taylor, Mark, p. 152.

These characterizations of Jesus' ministry are attained by the Evangelist through the transitional unit in 1:14-15. The result is that vss. 14-15 have reformulated the affirmation of 1:1 into a Christological characterization of Jesus' ministry: the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God is that Jesus preaches the gospel of God in the time of fulfillment and commands belief in that gospel. This affirmation represents the embryonic reflection upon Jesus' ministry that eventually led to a proclamation of that ministry from a fully developed Christological point of view (e.g. the Gospel of John).

---

[1] Marxsen, Markus, p. 88.

Mark 3:7-12

The understanding of Mark 1:14-15 as a Christological pivot point in the narrative is supported by the next transitional unit, 3:7-12:

> [7]Jesus withdrew with his disciples to the sea, and a great multitude from Galilee followed; also from Judea [8]and Jerusalem and Idumea and from beyond the Jordan and from about Tyre and Sidon a great multitude, hearing all that he did, came to him. [9]And he told his disciples to have a boat ready for him because of the crowd, lest they should crush him; [10]for he had healed many, so that all who had diseases pressed upon him to touch him. [11]And whenever the unclean spirits beheld him, they fell down before him and cried out, "You are the Son of God." [12]And he strictly ordered them not to make him known.

In this unit the preceding material is summarized with particular Marcan emphases, and the themes in the succeeding section are introduced. This double character of the unit makes a transition from the preceding to the succeeding narrative. In this transition Jesus is designated Son of God by the demons, his activity is now said to attract people from many places, and his power to heal is so great that people attempt to touch him for healing rather than having to get him to touch them. Hence, this paragraph is a transitional unit in which a significant Christological feature is introduced into the Marcan narrative.

Mark 3:7-12 has not been viewed previously as a transitional unit--B. W. Bacon's assertion that this paragraph was an "editorial breathing space"[1] most nearly approaches our emphasis. On the one hand, scholars have regarded this unit as the beginning of a new section in Mark,[1] and, on the other hand, C. H. Turner considered it to be the end of section 1:14-3:12[2] and L. E. Keck has argued that these verses are "the conclusion of the section begun at 1:16."[3] L. E. Keck has paved the way for us here, since even though he began his article with the above statement that Mark 3:7-12 is the conclusion of the preceding section in the Gospel, his analysis of the pericope actually demonstrated that 3:7-12 is a transitional unit.[4] He has shown that the Evangelist formed at 3:7-12 a paragraph which summarized the material which preceded it. Then the Evangelist took a unit that was part of a collection of material which is now distributed throughout the succeeding chapters 4-6 and fused it within 3:7-12. Finally, the Evangelist connected a title to the Christological function of Jesus in this part of the narrative by placing in the mouths of the demons the confession that Jesus is the Son of God.

---

[1] B. W. Bacon, "The Prologue of Mark: A Study of Sources and Structure," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXVI (1907), 87.

Mark 3:7-12 is generally recognized as a summary description of the activities of Jesus; therefore, some have considered it in its entirety to be a creation of the Evangelist.[5] This is certainly true with regard to vss. 11-12: these verses are entirely creations of the

---

[1] For a summary of these positions see Keck, "Mark 3.7-12," pp. 342-43.

[2] The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: S. P. C. K., n.d.), pp. 14, 21-22.

[3] Keck, "Mark 3.7-12," p. 343.

[4] Ibid., pp. 345-58. The discussion below seeks to establish this view of Keck's work.

[5] This view is asserted by Wendling, Entstehung, p. 19; Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 341; Taylor, Mark, p. 225; Burkill, Mysterious, pp. 64-97.

Evangelist. On this matter we find agreement between scholars who would otherwise disagree on many points. B. W. Bacon, discussing the controversy between J. Weiss and W. Wrede on the historical origin of the demon saying, stated: "The generalization in 3,11f is . . . obviously an editorial inference, . . . purely theoretic, . . ."[1] Indeed this is sufficiently certain that Keck says, ". . . we may regard vss. 11f. as Mark's addition. This so clearly expresses Mark's own ideas about the exorcisms and the 'messianic secret' that this conclusion needs neither defense nor demonstration today."[2] For our purposes this is extremely important, since in 3:11 the demons say to Jesus, "You are the Son of God." As we shall see below, the Evangelist's formulation of this confession with "you are" and the title "the Son of God" is important for an understanding of the overall Christological presentation of the Gospel.

With regard to 3:7-10, however, the situation is different. While the Evangelist has structured the entire paragraph in such a way that it serves his own theological and Christological purposes, probably an already existent form of tradition underlies vss. 7-10. In order to observe the total effect which the Evangelist intended from this paragraph, we shall attempt to distinguish between the underlying tradition and the Evangelist's redaction.

---

[1] "Demonic Recognition," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, VI (1905), 154. The entire sentence, in which Bacon is discussing the relation of Wrede's view on these verses to Weiss', reads thus: "The generalization in 3,11f is so obviously an editorial inference, so purely theoretic, that Wrede certainly can be doing no injustice when he assumes (S. 170) that Weiss would class this passage in 1,34 as simple 'Vervielfältigung.'" The point is that vs. 11 is a general statement created by the Evangelist on the basis of analogy with vss. 1:24 and 5:7, and vs. 12 in analogy with vss. 1:25, 34c, 44; 5:43.

[2] Keck, "Mark 3.7-12," pp. 346-47.

First of all, Keck called attention to the fact that in vss. 9-10 the themes of "boat" and "touching Jesus" are connected,[1] and that there is in the Gospel a cycle of traditions linked together by the theme of the boat and touching which shares the same image of the power of Jesus.[2] This cycle of traditions portrays Jesus as a healer with such great healing powers that one can be healed simply by touching him. As Keck has pointed out, in these materials there are no conflicts with Judaism. Rather than debates "about Jesus' healing, the Sabbath, or the authority by which he works . . . all of these stories tell of miracles that result from the supernatural power resident within Jesus in a way as to make him different from other men . . ."[3] The entire complex is found in: 3:9-10; 4:35-5:43; 6:31-56. On the basis of its linguistic peculiarities[4] and yet its interconnections with this cycle of stories,[5] Keck is surely right in considering 3:9-10 to be tradition which the Evangelist has incorporated into his paragraph at this point. For our purposes it is important to notice the distance of the first statement about the boat and touching Jesus from the rest of the materials in the cycle. In between this first appearance of these themes (3:9-10) and the continuance of them (4:35-5:43) stands the choosing of the Twelve (3:13-19), the accusation that Jesus casts out demons by Beelzebul (3:20-29), the problematic relationship between Jesus and his friends, his mother, and his brothers (3:21, 31-35), the parable of the Sower and its Interpretation (4:1-20), and a collection of parables (4:21-34). The distance in the narrative between the first boat-touching tradition (3:9-10) and the beginning of the boat-touching cycle (4:35) must be interpreted as an intentional introduction of these themes by the Evangelist at an earlier position in the narrative. He chose to introduce these themes in a paragraph which functioned as a transition point with regard to the activities and image of Jesus. In 3:9-10 the Evangelist has anticipated the themes which surround Jesus at the highest point of his healing ministry by placing this boat-touching tradition in this prior position in the narrative.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 347-49. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 349-52. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 349-50.

[4] *ploiarion*, *proskaterē*, and *epipiptein* are *hapax* *legomenon* in the Gospel of Mark. The Evangelist usually employs *ploion* which was also most prominent in the tradition which he used (used fifteen times in all--some are editorial, some were in the tradition); also usually simply *piptō* is used (5:22; 9:20; 14:35) or *prospiptō* (3:11; 5:33; 7:25). *dia* *tōn* *ochlon* is possibly an addition by the Evangelist into vs. 9 (cf. 2:4; *ochlos* occurs 38 times in the Gospel; *plethos* was the word used in this particular tradition [3:7, 8], it is not found elsewhere in the Gospel).

[5] *thlibō-sunthlibō*: 3:10; 5,24, 31; *mastigas*: 3:10; 5:29, 34; *haptō*: 3:10; 5:27, 28, 30, 31; 6:56 (twice).

Secondly, we must examine vss. 7-8. A problem arises concerning the attachment of vs. 7a to the previous or the following paragraph. Is the clause, "and Jesus withdrew with his disciples to the sea" to be attached to vs. 6 and thus end paragraph 3:1-6, or does it stand as the opening statement to vss. 7b-12? As Keck has said, only if one is looking for a historical motive for Jesus' withdrawal to the sea does vs. 7a become an important addition to the preceding paragraph; otherwise, a sensitivity to the scope of 3:7(b)-12 leads one to regard vs. 7a as the opening statement in a summary unit including all of vss. 7-12.[1] With regard to the stylistic features of these verses, it is noticeable that there are two references to "a great multitude" (this word for multitude occurs only here in Mark) with a different position of the adjective in each (polu plēthos/plēthos polu)--it is possible that this points to an underlying tradition. Also, it is difficult to decide if ēkolouthēsen (they followed) should be included or excluded to determine the relation of the place names to the first mentioned one, Galilee. The probability is that the Evangelist has distinguished Galileans from the others, saying that a great multitude of them "followed" and a great multitude of others "came to him."[1] On the basis of these and other data, Keck argued that the Evangelist has added all of the geographical references to a traditional statement that Jesus withdrew with his disciples to the sea and a great multitude followed.[2] If the Evangelist has added all of these place names or even some of them, what could be his purpose for doing so? On the one hand, his addition of Galilee would be understandable from his earlier statement that Jesus "came into Galilee" to preach (1:14) and his statements in 1:28 and 1:39 about preaching everywhere in Galilee. But, on the other hand, why all the other place names? The answer must be: to show Jesus' tremendous appeal beyond the Judean world.[3] First of all, this is demonstrated when 3:7-8 is compared with 1:5: in contrast to the Baptist to whom all the country of Judea and all the people of Jerusalem came out, all the people came out to Jesus from Judea, Jerusalem, Idumea, beyond the Jordan and from around Tyre and Sidon. Secondly, there has been a gradual build up in the narrative which reaches a new height in this statement: in 1:28 Jesus' fame spreads everywhere throughout all the surrounding region of Galilee, in 1:33 the entire city gathers at the door of the house in which Jesus is healing and casting out demons, in 1:39 he goes through all of Galilee to preach and cast out demons, in 1:45 when Jesus cannot openly enter a town the people come out to him "from everywhere," and in 2:2 and 2:13 many people gather with the result that Jesus speaks to them and teaches them. Thirdly, the references to Tyre and Sidon and beyond the Jordan anticipate Jesus' journey into those regions of Palestine in the forthcoming narrative (4:35; 5:1, 21; 7:24, 31) after these people have already come to him. Hence, these two verses acquire their significance in contrast to the simply Judean crowds which the Baptist attracted, as a climactic statement of the build up of response in the preceding narrative, and in their preparation for, and anticipation of, Jesus' ministry into the far regions of Palestine.

---

[1] Keck, "Mark 3.7-12," pp. 342, 346.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 345. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 347. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 353.

Thus, through a distinction between tradition and redaction in this unit, the motivation of the Evangelist in the additions and juxtaposition of the themes begins to appear. In 3:7-12 the Evangelist has: (a) either composed or added a traditional list of place names to a tradition that mentioned Jesus withdrawing to the sea, thus forming vss. 7-8; (b) he placed at vss. 9-10 a piece of tradition which had existed within a cycle of traditions now represented by 4:35-5:43; 6:31-56; and (c) he composed vss. 11-12 for the closing statements of this paragraph. We must now go back over this unit to view all of this editorial activity together and determine more completely the function which this unit performs in the narrative.

In the first place, the Evangelist formed this unit by listing the far regions from which the crowds come to see Jesus. As we have already noticed, this is a climactic statement in a succession of statements about Jesus' fame in 1:28, 32-33, 45; 2:2, 13 which stands in contrast to the strictly Judean crowd (all of the country of Judea and all the Jerusalemites) which came out to the Baptist (1:5) and also introduces an eventual ministry of Jesus into far regions. This feature of the unit indicates the expansive response to Jesus throughout the land to summarize the effect of his power in the preceding narrative and it drives the narrative proleptically towards the acceptance of Jesus by people in far regions and rejection by those in his homeland. The Evangelist's listing of the areas which the crowd represents was not simply to form a concluding report of Jesus' following as a result of his ministry; by the very areas listed it introduces features of Jesus' ministry that will be encountered in the ensuing narrative. The function of the listing of these areas is best described as transitional--this naming of places in relation to Jesus' ministry interconnects Jesus' previous activity with what will follow as it forms a specific impression with regard to that ministry. This listing thus creates a particularly striking impression of a healer and teacher who is performing a powerful and far reaching ministry throughout the land as it transports the themes of the preceding section into the following narrative.

The next step of the Evangelist was an even more remarkable and effective one: he placed at 3:9-10 a segment from the cycle of traditions about the boat and touching Jesus (4:35-5:43; 6:31-56). Since this cycle has integrally fused within it an emphasis upon crowds,[1] a segment from it can add new impetus to his picture of the growing crowds in the previous section. The crowds throng around him to touch him, and when the crowds throng around him, Jesus uses the boat from which to teach them and with which to go away from them to another place. As we noticed earlier, the people responded to Jesus' ministry by coming to him in great throngs. But throughout the preceding section the response was constantly building and not yet fully established at its height. In this regard the Evangelist referred to the great numbers of peoples who were responding to the authority of Jesus (1:34; 2:2, 4, 13, 15), but after 3:7-12 he begins to distinguish between Jesus' friends (disciples and family) and the crowds (3:20, 32; 4:1, 36; 5:21, 24, 27, 30, 31, etc.). As the narrative moves on, the crowds continue to gather but Jesus' friends misunderstand and, finally, flee from him. It is in this unit that Jesus' involvement with crowds is introduced in relation to the use of a boat and touching Jesus, and in this way the stage is set for the next section of the Gospel. In the next section Jesus teaches the crowds from a boat (4:1-34) and then Jesus is portrayed by the cycle of material which carries out the theme of the boat and touching (4:35-5:43; 6:31-56). This same feature, however, also makes an assertion about Jesus and his work: Jesus is the one who performs such great acts that the crowds throng about him.

---

[1] See references to the crowd in 4:36; 5:21, 24, 27, 30, 31; 6:34, 45.

Finally, the addition of vss. 11-12 to this unit by the Evangelist effected a crucial Christological statement about the meaning and function of Jesus of Nazareth. Actually, the picture of Jesus' great power in teaching and healing is clear at this point in the narrative; the crucial step for the Evangelist was the characterization of this power with the title Son of God. The Evangelist achieved this by depicting the unclean spirits as crying out, "You are the Son of God." Out of eight occurrences of divine sonship titles in the Gospel, five of them contain a form of the verb eimi. This means of identifying Jesus in the narrative gives these confessions special emphasis. As E. Norden noticed, confessions formed with su ei (1:11; 3:11 [14:61]), houtos estin (9:7; 15:39), and egō eimi (14:62) have a claim to formula status within the soteriological confessions of a religious community.[1] This use of the verb "to be" indicates that the Evangelist understood these utterances as key confessions of the status of Jesus. This does not mean that he is most of all interested in making ontic affirmations about Jesus, however. That view would surely misrepresent the Gospel presentation. He wishes rather to characterize the activity and function of Jesus Christ as essential in the religious community of which he is a part. This admittedly pushes toward the questions: "how" can he do this, "where" does he get the authority to do these things, and "who" is this that he can perform such acts? But with regard to the being of Jesus there is a reserve in Mark represented by the messianic secret and submission to the passion episodes that is not exercised by the fourth Gospel where Jesus' divine status is affirmed in the prologue and built upon in the narrative. The function of the Son of God acclamation in the Marcan Gospel and the particular conception of the function of Jesus Christ in this part of the narrative must now command our attention.

The Authoritative Son of God

It is well known that the concept of Jesus as the Son of God has a prominent place in the Marcan Gospel narrative. There are a number of variant titles, however, which are used in the presentation of this concept, and for this reason we must first of all indicate the extent of the variation and the frequency with which these titles occur.

---

[1] Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913), pp. 175-201.

There are at least eight occurrences in the Gospel of a title which represents the concept Son of God.[1] The first occurrence of the title, if one thinks the manuscript evidence supports it, is found in the superscription in 1:1 which introduces the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God. The same title, (ho) huios (tou) theou, occurs at 3:11; 5:7; and 15:39. In 14:61 the title occurs with "the Blessed" as a circumlocution for the name of God. Then, the title comes from the heavenly voice as "my Beloved Son" in 1:11 and 9:7, and "Beloved Son" occurs in 12:6 in the parable of the Vineyard. Thus, five of these titles contain both of the words huios and theos (or a circumlocution for theos), and three consist of huios and agapētos (two of these have the pronoun "my" which refers to God).

In the expanse of the narrative which we are analyzing in this section (1:1-5:43), four of these eight occurrences are to be found: at the very beginning (1:1); in the Baptism (1:11); in a Marcan summary which we have designated as a transitional unit (3:11); and in the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (5:7).[2] This concentration of one-half of the occurrences within the first third of the Gospel requires discussion of this concept in the context of the first two sections of the Marcan narrative.

---

[1] Not included in this is the title, ho hagios tou theou, in 1:24 which the Evangelist most likely views in the same way as he does ho huios tou theou. Also not included, 13:32 speaks of ho huios in correlation with ho pater; there is disagreement whether this title should be thought of in terms of Son of man or Son of God.

[2] In addition, ho hagios tou theou occurs in 1:24 and ho huios tou anthrōpou occurs in 2:10, 28. The significance of the former will be discussed below, the latter in the section on the Rejected-Rising Son of man.

If the title Son of God stands authentically in the superscription of Mark, a very interesting contrast exists between this Gospel and Matthew, Luke, and John. The Gospel of Matthew begins with "Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham" (Matt. 1:1), the Gospel of John begins with "in the beginning was the Word" (John 1:1), and the Gospel of Luke begins with an interest in "the things which have been accomplished among us" (Luke 1:1).

First of all, the Lucan Evangelist differs from the other three: he has neither the name of Jesus nor a title for Jesus in his prologue. Instead, he intends to concentrate upon "the things which have been accomplished." There is reason to believe that this statement corresponds well with the purpose of the Lucan Evangelist: instead of writing about Jesus, he reflects upon the nature of the tradition and offers the tradition of Paul and the Church (Acts) as well as the tradition about the Lord and his apostles (Luke).[1] In contrast, the other Evangelists are concerned in a primary way with a view of Jesus; therefore, they begin with a title which indicates their particular conception of Jesus. Matthew, Mark, and John limit their narrative to the story of Jesus; in this they are comparable, yet this brings us to the second part of the contrast.

In contrast to the Matthean Evangelist's interest in Jesus Christ as the Son of David, the Son of Abraham, and the Johannine Evangelist's interest in Jesus as the Word, the Marcan Evangelist focuses upon Jesus Christ as the Son of God. When the variation in the titles used at the beginning of each of these Gospels is correlated with the different emphases in each one, it seems justified to suggest that the titles which stand at the beginning of a Gospel indicate a dimension of the Evangelist's conception of the risen Lord. Of course, as already indicated, it is not possible, with Mark, to assert without caution that the title Son of God stood in the opening sentence from the very beginning (maybe only the name Jesus Christ), since many manuscripts omit the title. But, a number of scholars have argued strongly for its inclusion in the Gospel at this point,[1] and even if the title was not originally in the first verse of the Gospel, it certainly is congruous with it. Of special interest is Mark 14:61-62, where the high priest asks Jesus, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?", to which Jesus replies, "I am." Thus, the phrase, "the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," at the beginning of the work would be entirely suitable for the opening verse of the narrative--these are the titles which Jesus confesses in the narrative to be true for himself. Whether or not huiou theou was written into the first verse by the Evangelist, it seems to represent a key title which he used when referring to Jesus.

---

[1] Hans Conzelmann, "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity," in Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. by L. E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 305-06.

We must now inquire into the concept or concepts which the Evangelist may have intended to evoke through his use of the title Son of God. In order to approximate this, it is necessary to look briefly into the concepts related to this title in Classical and Hellenistic Greek literature, and in the Old Testament and Jewish literature.

---

[1] Above, p. 73, n. 1.

In Greek literature, a rather fixed conception that a mortal is the son of a god arises in only three definite areas, apart from the Greek gods and hero legends.[1] First of all, in relatively early times (500 B.C.) the healer was designated as an Asclepiad, a term indicating his sonship to Asclepius.[2] Only through sonship was the art of healing passed on from one healer to another, and through this sonship the healer's powers received their divine rooting in Asclepius. Asclepius himself was considered to have received the power not only to heal the sick (*iasthai nosountas*), but also to raise the dead (*enēgeire tous apothanontas*/*egeirein tethnekotas*/*anistanai tethneōtas*), because he had received his skills from a god.[3] Secondly, the title Son of God (*huios* [*tou*] *theou*) occurred in ruler worship, which had oriental (Egyptian) roots, from the time of Alexander the Great through the Roman imperial cultus.[4] While it is considered doubtful that the use of the term in the imperial cultus had a primary place in the earliest applications and uses of the term in Christianity, it is, as R. H. Fuller has put it, "not for nothing that of the various christological terms which the Hellenistic Jewish missionaries brought to the Hellenistic world, it was the two which were also prominent in the imperial cultus, *kyrios* and son of God, which 'stuck.'"[1] Thirdly, the title Son of God was used by Gnostics who were openly in controversy with Christian apologetic. The basic source for our knowledge, that especially Simon Magus used this term but also other Gnostics, comes from Origen's Contra Celsum.[2] Most likely this use of the term stems from a combination of the use of the term by the Christian believers with reference to their Lord and the Gnostic's interpretation of his own status in the world on the basis of the type of philosophical speculation available to him from the Hellenistic world. A word must be added indicating that some scholars now think Bieler left a false impression when he asserted that theios anēr was a technical term with a fixed conception in early Greek literature which then stood very close to the title huios theou used in the Christian community.[3] Rather, they indicate, theios can be used either with anēr or anthrōpos, and the more or less clear concept of divinity has no firm terminology affixed with it, and expecially no emphasis upon sonship. With this view, the connection of the concept of Son of God and designation as theios, so far as it occurs, is accidental. Therefore, the concept of the divine man in the Hellenistic world does not support the idea of sonship of a god; rather the idea of sonship arises in a special way with regard to the function of healing and in the context of a divine ruler.

---

[1] Wülfing von Martitz, "*Huios*," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, VIII, 339.

[2] Theognis *Elegiae* 432-34; see E. J. and Ludwig Edelstein, *Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*, I (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1945), 104.

[3] Xenophon *Cynegeticus* 1. 6; see Edelstein, *Asclepius*, I, 34, 112. [Apollodorus] *Bibliotheca* III, 10. 3. 8-9; see Edelstein, *Asclepius*, I, 49.

[4] A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, trans. by L. R. M. Strachan (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927), pp. 346-48; Martitz, "*Huios*," p. 336.

In the Old Testament and Jewish literature, divine sonship terminology with reference to mortals occurs in three kinds of contexts: (a) kingship ideology in the Old Testament; (b) usage of these scriptural passages in a messianic context in pre-Christian Judaism (one example); (c) usage of the term huios theou (hupsistou) in Hellenistic Judaism for the suffering righteous Jew when he is scorned by those who do not follow Jewish laws or practices (two examples).

---

[1] Fuller, Foundations, pp. 88-89. [2] Martitz, "Huios," p. 339.

[3] Ibid., pp. 339-40.

The king is designated as divine Son in three places in Old Testament literature (II Sam. 7:14; Ps. 2:7; 89:27-28; cf. the Hexaplaric text of Ps. 110:3). In each instance the statement of sonship comes from the Lord and is directed toward the king of the Davidic dynasty. This activity of attributing divine sonship to the king derives either from Mesopotamian or Egyptian ritual where the ruler of the people is either adopted or begotten as the divine Son.[1] Exactly what Israel did with these traditions at its earliest stages is highly controversial, but it is clear that the developed Israelite view of kingship lacked a physical conception of the relationship between the king and the Lord.[2] Instead, the intention of the sonship terminology is to characterize the Son as the specially selected representative between the Lord and his people. The declaration of sonship is, then, the means of legitimating the king to carry out the work of God[3] or adopting him as Son to establish him for his task.[4]

In pre-Christian Palestinian Judaism, divine sonship terminology occurs only in quotations of Old Testament passages which were interpreted messianically.[1] The use of II Sam. 7:14 in a messianic context in Palestinian Judaism has been confirmed by 4QFlor. 10-14 (4QpII Sam. 7:10-14) in the Dead Sea materials. However, the title Son of God was avoided by Judaism in pre-Christian times, most likely to prevent any misunderstanding of a messianic figure's physical sonship with the Lord.[2] The occurrences of filius meus in IV Ezra 7:28-29; 13:32, 37, 52; 14:9, which at first seem to support the usage of "my Son" as a title for the Messiah, have been shown to represent the Greek pais which in turn was based on the Hebrew abhdi.[3]

---

[1] Cf. and contrast Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh, trans. by G. W. Anderson (New York: Abingdon Press, 1954), pp. 75-78, and Fohrer, "Huios," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, VIII, 349-52.

[2] Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 76-78.

[3] Fohrer, "Huios," pp. 350-52; with this view, "legitimation" is distinguished from "adoption."

[4] Mowinckel, He That Cometh, p. 78; with this explanation, "adoption" is identical with the "anointing and installation."

In Hellenistic Judaism the title Son of God is used by the Gentile to scorn the righteous Jew whom he is torturing or killing.[4] In addition, as Ferd. Hahn has skillfully indicated, Hellenistic Judaism began to emphasize individual "men of God"; however, of just as great importance, never is the "man of God" (anthrōpos theou) or "divinely inspired man" (thespesios anēr [Philo]) called a "Son of God."[5] The explanation of this data seems to be that the Hellenistic Jews began to incorporate those elements of the divine man in the Hellenistic world into the picture of the men of God (prophets, etc.) of the Old Testament which were compatible with the Old Testament tradition. But those components which were incompatible with the Old Testament--metaphysical origin, an ability to perform miracles as an attestation of his divinity--were bypassed in the characterization of the Old Testament "man of God."

---

[1] Mowinckel, He That Cometh, pp. 293-94, 368.

[2] Lohse, "Huios," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, VIII, 361-63.

[3] B. Violet, Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924); see Fuller, Foundations, p. 32 and Mowinckel, He That Cometh, p. 294.

[4] Wisdom 2:18; 5:5; cf. Sirach 4:10: the righteous man shall be "as a son of the Most High."

[5] Hahn, Titles, pp. 288-91; Schweizer, "Huios," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, VIII, 357; Fuller, Foundations, pp. 68-72.

The earliest use of the Son of God title in early Christianity (Palestinian Jewish Christianity) appears in application to the end time function of Jesus, and this usage is now to be found most clearly in Luke 1:32-33 and Mark 14:61-62.[1] In the latter passage, Jesus is depicted as one who will be installed into an eschatological office of honor and authority and will bring salvation in the end time. This application of the Son of God title in Palestinian Christianity lived on for a time in the Hellenistic Jewish community as is demonstrated by I Thess. 1:9-10 but soon moved into the "man of God" concept which was present within Hellenistic Judaism. The "man of God" concept, as Hahn has proposed it, consisted of an interpretation of Old Testament prophets with the attributes of the *theios anēr* concept which were compatible with the Old Testament view.[2] In this way, the miraculous feats of especially Moses and Elijah were emphasized but, in contrast to Hellenism, these men were never given divine status--they were mighty men who possessed the Spirit of God and through whom God worked. When Hellenistic Jewish Christianity applied this "man of God" concept to Jesus, the traditions of Jesus' healings and exorcisms achieved a prominent status in the community. Two of these traditions are found in this first section of Mark which we have been discussing:

---

[1] Hahn, *Titles*, pp. 284-86. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 288-91.

the controversy over Jesus and Beelzebul (3:20-29), and the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (5:1-20). In the first of these traditions no title is applied to Jesus, but in the second Jesus is acclaimed as the Son of the Most High God.

In addition, some traditions had arisen in the Palestinian community around the concept of Jesus as the New Moses according to the picture of the charismatic man of God in the Israelite tradition. The prime example of such a tradition is found as the first exorcism of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark, the Man with an Unclean Spirit (1:21-28). In this tradition, the address of the man to Jesus (_ti hēmin kai soi anthrōpe tou theou_) is reminiscent of the address of the woman to Elijah in I Kings 17:18 before he brought her son back to life, and the address "the Holy One of God" (_ho hagios tou theou_) indicates its Palestinian origin. In the Palestinian community the activity of Jesus as a "New Moses" came to be recounted, but it was inconceivable in that community that this activity be connected with the title Son of God.[1] This was first achieved in the Hellenistic Jewish community where a circumlocution, most often _hupsistos_, the Most High, would be used for the name of God. This represents clearly the situation in the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (5:1-20) where the presuppositions concerning the swine indicate a Palestinian origin for the exorcism, but the title _Iēsou, huie tou theou tou hupsistou_ indicates the further development of this story in the Hellenistic Jewish sphere of Christianity.[2] In this sphere of Christianity a new step was taken in the proclamation of Jesus' power. Jesus was no longer simply the Holy One of God who cast out demons by the Spirit (or finger

---

[1] _Ibid._, pp. 231-34, 291-92. [2] _Ibid._, pp. 291-92.

[Luke 11:20]) of God but himself was the bearer of that Spirit and was called God's Son. This view of Jesus is represented by the Baptism story in Mark 1:9-11 where the heavens open and the Spirit comes down upon Jesus in the form of a dove and the heavenly voice says, "Thou art my Beloved Son, with thee I am well pleased." The descent of the Spirit upon Jesus and the designation of Jesus as "my Son" are the essential and distinctive aspects of the Baptism tradition as it was used in Hellenistic Jewish Christianity and as it stands in the Gospel of Mark.[1]

In Hellenistic Gentile Christianity the view of Jesus as Son of God was strengthened so that Jesus possessed divine power that was immediately available through him, and this eventually led to a view either of his pre-existence with God or his divine birth. The Hellenistic Gentile Christian view of Jesus possessing this divine power is represented by Mark 4:35-41, the Calming of a Storm, and 5:25-34, the Woman who Touched Jesus' Garment.[2]

It is especially revealing to observe the positioning of the traditions in the narrative which present Jesus according to the various concepts of Son of God which have existed in the Christian communities. First of all, the Evangelist has placed the tradition of the Baptism of Jesus in the introduction to his Gospel as a key affirmation of Jesus' status as the divine Son upon whom the Spirit is bestowed. This tradition also connects John the Baptist and Jesus by its given context. The Evangelist defines this relationship of Jesus and the Baptist in his first transitional unit--by contrasts Jesus' ministry is introduced in a time of fulfillment and he preaches the gospel of God in Galilee, but also the Baptist's ministry is introduced as a contrapuntal theme in the narrative through the interconnection of the fate of his ministry and Jesus' passion. Consequently, the Baptism story characterizes Jesus as the divine Son in the midst of the contrast between Jesus and the Baptist at the beginning of the narrative.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 293-94. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 302-03.

Secondly, after the pericope of calling disciples, Jesus performs his first exorcism, the Man with an Unclean Spirit (1:21-28). In this exorcism the unclean spirit addresses Jesus as the Holy One of God who has come to destroy him. This address to Jesus by an unclean spirit is interrelated with the confessions of Jesus as Son of God by demons in 3:11 and 5:7, and they must be discussed together. We have seen that 3:11 falls within a Marcan summary and because of its general nature and context it is to be seen as a Marcan composition.[1] It has been intimated by some that either 1:24 or 5:7 is also a creation of the Evangelist,[2] but this appears to be unlikely. Rather, we have to see the way in which the Evangelist has placed the stories in which these confessions of Jesus as Son of God occur to appreciate their importance for the Marcan picture of Jesus Christ.

After Jesus' calling of Simon and Andrew, James and John, he enters a synagogue, teaches with authority and casts out an unclean spirit (1:21-28). This story is placed at this point in the Gospel "to give a paradigmatic illustration of the ministry of Jesus"[3] at the outset of that ministry. The episode emphasizes at the very beginning of Jesus' activity his authority in teaching[1] and his authority in casting out unclean spirits (demons).[2] The Evangelist has selected a miracle story which originated in the Palestinian community depicting an exorcism (vss. 23-26) upon which to build his affirmation that Jesus' ministry consists of extraordinarily authoritative teaching. By doing this, the Evangelist shows that he is interested in depicting Jesus' authoritative teaching primarily through his healing activities rather than through great discourses of his teaching. This story represents, in the view of Hahn, the Palestinian view of Jesus as the New Moses who performs miracles as a part of his charismatic office.[3] The title "the Holy One of God" has most likely arisen through the Nazarite tradition connected with the address, Jesus the Nazarene.[4] It stresses that the healer possesses the holy/clean Spirit which confronts the unholy/unclean spirits. Since this is the only occurrence of this title in the Gospel, one naturally wonders what this title meant for the Evangelist. Surely the most important part of its meaning is that it participates in the concept of Jesus as an exorcist, and, as seen in the previous section, when the Evangelist formulated his own address for the demons in 3:11 the title for Jesus was ho huios tou theou (the Son of God).[5] Thus one can suppose that for the Evangelist this title approximated the title ho huios tou theou and contributes to the meaning of Jesus as an exorcist.[1]

---

[1] Above, pp. 78-79.

[2] Bacon, Gospel Story, pp. 3, 17. This view seems impossible to substantiate with regard to 1:24 and 5:7; cf. Burkill, Mysterious, p. 63.

[3] Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 209.

---

[1] See vss. 21, 27.

[2] See vss. 26, 27. Best, Temptation and Passion, pp. 68-69, 111, wishes to stress the teaching as the primary and prior act of power in Jesus' ministry on the basis of 1:21-28. He is probably correct in his emphasis, and his choice of 1:21-28 to make his point witnesses to the "paradigmatic" character of the episode in the Gospel.

[3] Hahn, Titles, pp. 291-92. [4] Ibid., pp. 321-22, n. 73.

[5] Above, pp. 78-79.

The next appearance of the title Son of God is found at 3:11 which is a focal pivot point in the narrative where Jesus' exorcism activity is for the first time clearly designated as "Son of God" activity by the Evangelist. The next occurrence of the title then is at 5:7 in the story of the Gerasene Demoniac. The title in this story, Jesus, Son of the Most High God, most likely was embedded within this story when the Evangelist took it over.[2] However, the Evangelist has placed this exorcism with this explicit reference to Jesus as Son of the Most High God in his narrative so that it contributes in a decisive way to his Christological presentation of Jesus of Nazareth. After the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac, two more mighty acts, the Woman who Touched Jesus' Garment (5:24-34) which is sandwiched in between the introduction and conclusion of the Raising of Jairus' Daughter (5:21-23, 35-43), are performed by Jesus before the theme of rejection is introduced into the Christological characterization of Jesus in the narrative (6:1-6). In these two stories Jesus' power is as great as that of the divine healer in the Hellenistic world within whom the power to perform miraculous feats is directly resident and within whom the power is so present that even by touching him (rather than having the healer touch the sick person) the power can flow out and heal. In the story of the Gerasene

---

[1] Cf. Cullmann, Christology, p. 285. Surely the holiness concept is preferred here to contrast with the unclean spirits.

[2] C. H. Cave, "The Obedience of Unclean Spirits," New Testament Studies, XI (1964-65), 93-97; T. A. Burkill, "Concerning 5 7 and 5 18-20," Studia Theologia, XI (1957), 160-61.

Demoniac and in the episode of the Woman Touching Jesus and being healed we reach the manifestation of the theme introduced by the Evangelist in 3:10-11--the people thronged around Jesus to touch him and the unclean spirits cried out, "You are the Son of God." In the Raising of Jairus' Daughter we may very well encounter a theme within the early Church that Jesus was decisively rejected when he raised a person from death to life.[1] Consequently, the last three episodes in this section portray Jesus (a) in mighty demonstration of exorcistic power over a legion of demons during which Jesus is confessed as "Son of the Most High God," (b) possessing such healing power that a woman can be healed simply by touching Jesus, and (c) being able to raise a young girl from death to life. The activities characterize Jesus as a tremendously powerful healer and exorcist, and in these episodes Jesus is designated Son of the Most High God.

In the Marcan narrative, then, the first two sections build up to a tremendous image of Jesus as an exorcist and healer. In between the two sections stands a unit constructed by the Evangelist which introduces this great power and correlates it with the title Son of God. At the beginning of the sections stands an exorcism in which Jesus is acclaimed as the Holy One of God, a title which would be at home in the Palestinian community as Jesus was characterized as having power over the "unclean (unholy) spirits." At the end of the sections stands an exorcism of a legion of demons by Jesus in which Jesus is hailed as Son of the Most High God, the title (without the designation, God) which would be at home in Hellenistic Jewish Christianity. Thus the activity of Jesus as the Holy One of God and as the Son of the Most High is brought under the one title Son of God by the Evangelist and material presenting Jesus with this great power is placed in these two sections by the Evangelist.

---

[1] See Lightfoot, History, p. 191.

The editorial and compositional activity in these two sections add another dimension to the affirmation of Jesus as Son of God in his healing ministry. The descent of the Spirit upon Jesus and his successful encounter with Satan[1] are surely to be correlated with Jesus' power over the unclean spirits and demons in his ministry (1:21-28; 1:32-34; 3:20-30; 5:1-20). On the other hand, the redactional emphasis in the first exorcism indicates that through his exorcism of the unclean spirit Jesus has demonstrated a "new teaching" which reveals authority "not as the scribes."[2] This redactional emphasis that Jesus' exorcism is part of his authoritative teaching is to be correlated with the content of the first transitional unit, 1:14-15. In that passage the meaning of Jesus' ministry is given in terms of the proclamation of the Church. The important feature of the proclamation of the Church is not discovered in a collection of "the teaching" of Jesus and giving it a setting in the ministry of Jesus (Matthew is the example of this perspective) but of giving the teaching in terms of the activities of Jesus. Those activities include teaching (4:1-34; 8:27-10:45; 13:1-37), but the teaching of Jesus is always intertwined in a context of the activities. This context is just as important for understanding the message as is the content of the teachings which are found in the narrative.[1]

---

[1] See Best, Temptation and Passion, pp. 10-18.

[2] Knigge, "Meaning," pp. 54-56.

But we must make further inquiry into the redactional interpretation of the exorcism as "new teaching." The emphasis of the redaction in 2:1-12, where a miracle story is expanded with a controversy, is the same as that in 1:21-28--a healing supports Jesus' authoritative teaching. In this instance, the healing demonstrates the authority of Jesus to forgive sins, and the ability to forgive sins represents an important Christological function of Jesus Christ in the Church (I Cor. 15:3).[2]

Finally, in the opening section of Jesus' ministry the redactional activity indicates that Jesus' authority will be met with crucifixion (1:14; 3:6), but the Christological titles and the Christological function of Jesus do not yet have this theme integrated into them in this part of the narrative. The Christological affirmations within the wonder working traditions did not include the aspect of suffering and death which Jesus underwent, and this is the problem with which the Marcan Evangelist deals. Since this suffering is an essential aspect of the Evangelist's Christological statement, he redirected the previous Christological tradition. In the present expanse of the narrative, however, the Evangelist designated the wonder working activities of Jesus under the title Son of God, and at this point Son of God refers primarily to Jesus' authority. When this material is once collected around this title, then the stage is ready for further incorporating into this title the motifs of rejection, suffering, and death. These themes are incorporated into the titles in the next two sections of the narrative, then the complete correlation of these themes with the passion narrative is effected through the transition in chapter 13.

---

[1] Schweizer, "Anmerkungen," pp. 35-46; "Contribution," pp. 421-24.

[2] Knigge, "Meaning," pp. 55-56.

Mark 6:1-6 and 8:27-33

The next two units, 6:1-6 and 8:27-33, incorporate the theme of rejection into the characterization of Jesus through the application of a particular title to him: 6:1-6 by introducing the title prophet in application to Jesus, 8:27-33 through the title Son of man. In each case the title need not necessarily have carried the idea of rejection with it in the early communities, but the Marcan Evangelist has introduced each title in a context which depicts Jesus as the one who must be rejected and must die. Prior to these two units the theme of rejecting Jesus had been introduced in reactions against him on various occasions by the scribes (2:6-7, 16; 3:22), Pharisees (2:24; 3:6), Herodians (3:6), and his family (3:21, 31-35). In none of these instances, however, did the titles characterizing Jesus incorporate this theme into Jesus' activity in the narrative. In 6:1-6 this is achieved by defining Jesus as a prophet without honor in his own country, among his own kin, and in his own house; in 8:27-33 this theme becomes completely fused within the Christological depiction of Jesus through the title Son of man used to designate one who must suffer, be rejected, be killed, and after three days rise again.

Mark 6:1-6

The next transitional unit to be analyzed is found at Mark 6:1-6:

> [1]He went away from there and came to his own country; and his disciples followed him. [2]And on the sabbath he began to teach in the synagogue; and many who heard him were astonished,

> saying, "Where did this man get all this? What is the wisdom given to him? What mighty works are wrought by his hands! [3]Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us?" And they took offense at him. [4]And Jesus said to them, "A prophet is not without honor, except in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house." [5]And he could do no mighty work there, except that he laid his hands upon a few sick people and healed them. [6]And he marvelled because of their unbelief.

This unit receives its transitional character from the way it introduces Jesus into a general synagogue situation of teaching and healing (Jesus' primary activity in the preceding narrative) and transforms this into a setting of rejection which renders Jesus incapable of performing any mighty works. The transitional aspect of this unit arises through the appropriation of content from the preceding narrative and the introduction of the concept of the rejected prophet which threads through the succeeding narrative and is reformulated in the next transitional unit, 8:27-33. Here we will discuss the transitional character of the unit in relation to the redactional activity in it; below we will analyze its Christological import in this section of the Gospel.

The disagreement over the dividing point in this part of the Marcan narrative has produced interpretations of 6:1-6 both as the conclusion to the preceding section and as the introduction to the succeeding section. Many commentators have considered 3:7-6:13 to depict the height of Jesus' Galilean ministry, and 6:14 begins Jesus' ministry beyond Galilee.[1] Recently, however, some scholars have argued that 6:1-6(a) represents the conclusion to the preceding section, and that 6:6b or 6:7 begins a new section. E. Schweizer considers 6:1-6a to be the conclusion to the preceding section: it presents a statement of the rejection of Jesus (its prior parallel is 3:6) to which 6:6b is a summary which is followed by the sending out of the disciples (6:7-13).[1] Thus for Schweizer 6:1-13 fits into a thrice-repeated pattern which he sees in the Gospel: after a climaxing conflict, a new section begins with a summary and is followed immediately by the call of the disciples. J. Schmid, also, considers 6:1-6a to represent the conclusion to the preceding section. For him, the general editorial statement in vs. 6b that "Jesus went about among the villages teaching" begins a new section in which it is as if Jesus, as a result of the rejection in his own country, consciously avoided great places and cities during the rest of his ministry.[2] L. E. Keck regards each section as beginning with a call to disciples; thus 6:1-7a concludes the past section, and 6:7b-13, the sending out of the disciples, begins the next section in Mark.[3] For these men, then, 6:1-6(7a) represents the conclusion to the preceding section in the Gospel. Further, however, there are commentators who have considered that a new section begins in the Gospel with 6:1-6.[4] E. Klostermann, the principal advocate of this view, emphasized that since the Evangelist himself understood the section from 6:34-8:26 as depicting the disciples' insistent lack of understanding in spite of all the deeds of Jesus, 6:1-6 would function as an introduction to this section even more appropriately than 6:14-29.[1]

---

[1] V. Taylor's division at this point represents a widespread view, Mark, p. 107.

---

[1] Schweizer, Evangelium, p. 70.

[2] J. Schmid, Das Evangelium nach Markus (4th ed.; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1958), pp. 119-20.

[3] Keck, "Introduction," p. 356 considers 6:7a to be simply a restatement of what Jesus does in the section which began at 3:13--Jesus called twelve disciples to him. In 6:7b "the disciples (are) sent out to do what III.14 said was Jesus' aim in appointing them."

[4] E. Klostermann, Markusevangelium (4th ed.; 1950); Hilgenfeld, Markusevangelium; F. C. Baur, Das Markusevangelium (Tübingen: Ludw. Friedr. Fues., 1851).

This lack of agreement over the boundaries of these sections points toward an understanding of 6:1-6 as a transitional unit. The disagreement is understandable when one is trying to discover the division by looking for Jesus' conscious decision with regard to his ministry (J. Schmid) or by looking for the disciples' involvement in the ministry of Jesus (Schweizer, Keck, Klostermann). However, if one regards the main character in the narrative to be Jesus of Nazareth and attempts to ascertain the particular view of Jesus which the Evangelist desired to set forth, then one quickly sees that in 6:1-6 the author has crucially shifted the image of Jesus: while Jesus was the authoritative and powerful Son of God in the preceding narrative, he is now depicted as a rejected prophet who can temporarily perform no mighty works because of his rejection. This shift in emphasis is not effected through a completely abrupt introduction of the theme of rejection into the narrative, however. This redirecting of the image of Jesus is produced by transition: rejection themes from the preceding narrative are introduced into a synagogue scene also typical of the preceding narrative, then this theme centers upon Jesus as a rejected prophet--a title and concept which is interconnected with the succeeding narrative.

The transitional character of this unit is clarified by an analysis of the Evangelist's redactional activity in it. That the Evangelist did take an active role in the construction of this paragraph is conspicuous from the inconsistencies within it: first there is a favorable reaction of the people to Jesus' teaching in the synagogue, then suddenly the people "take offense (eskandalizonto) at him" (6:3c); next it is said that "he could do no mighty work there" (6:5a), then this is partially withdrawn by the clause, "except that he laid his hands upon a few sick people and healed them" (6:5b). On the basis of this incongruity, calling attention to the central place of the saying in 6:4, Bultmann cited this unit as "a typical example of how an imaginary situation (eine ideale Szene) is built up out of an independent saying."[1] He is correct in saying that this unit was constructed around the saying about the rejected prophet, but our evidence points further to the final construction of this paragraph by the Evangelist himself.

---

[1] E. Klostermann, Markusevangelium, p. 54.

First, we must examine the two opening verses of the paragraph. Mark 6:1 ("and he came to his own country [patris]") has been formulated by the Evangelist in relation to the prophet saying in 6:4 ("A prophet is not without honor except in his own country [patris]").[2] Mark 6:2 stands as a doublet to 1:21-22, 27.[3] The companion tradition in chapter 1 represents the first time that Jesus entered a synagogue and the tradition in the unit which we are now investigating represents the last time that Jesus enters a synagogue. If we ask whether the Evangelist himself wished to have this noticed, we can compare the similar way in which this unit and Jesus' first appearance in a synagogue begins.[4] In contrast to that first appearance of Jesus in the synagogue (1:21-28), in 6:1-6, although the people are amazed at his teaching and acts of power, they take offense at him so that their unbelief makes it impossible for him to perform any significant healings.

---

[1] Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, p. 31. [2] Wendling, Entstehung, p. 53.

[3] Ibid. [4] Lightfoot, Locality, p. 186.

Next, we must consider the saying in vs. 4, and especially so since this saying has a history in the tradition which is important for the distinction between tradition and redaction in 6:1-6. The earliest form of this saying is represented by John 4:44 (cf. Luke 4:24): "A prophet has no honor in his own country." While this saying itself relates to Nazareth, this Jewish saying could also be applied to Jesus in relation to his fate in Jerusalem, and as such it stands in relation to tradition such as that found in Matt. 23:37.[1] But also within the tradition Jesus was viewed as a healer (Mark 2:17), and in the reflection upon the people's opinion about Jesus, the saying about the rejected prophet was connected with a saying about Jesus as a healer (cf. Luke 4:23). With this latter addition the saying became a statement about Jesus' fate in relation to his work and was available for the Evangelist to construct the scene of the rejection in his _patris_.[2] A tradition parallel to that which was used by the Evangelist to form 6:1-6 is found in Gospel of Thomas 31 and Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 6:

> No prophet is acceptable in his village [_patris_],
> No physician heals those who know him.

This double saying about prophet-healer (physician) is most likely earlier than Mark 6:4-5 and is probably the approximate form of the tradition which the Evangelist used to create this unit.[1] It is this form of underlying tradition that led to the type of statement now found in 6:5:[2] "He could do no mighty work there, except that he laid his hands upon a few sick people and healed them." The statement that he could do no mighty work there is based upon the last part of the double saying which the Evangelist has then revised by his own addition: Jesus healed a few sick people. This revision is undoubtedly due to the Evangelist's presentation of such great healing power within Jesus that it would be unlikely that he would go anywhere without healing someone.

---

[1] E. Lohmeyer, _Das Evangelium des Markus_ (17th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1967), p. 112.

[2] _Ibid_.

But there are two other statements in the saying in Mark which are not found in the saying: a prophet is not without honor except (a) among his own kin, and (b) in his own house. Both of these phrases have surely been added by the Evangelist: neither is found in the Lucan parallel and "among his own kin" is ommitted in Matthew. "In his own house" may well relate back to the previous statements about Jesus "in his house" in 2:1 and 3:20. The point is that now Jesus is rejected even in his own house after two previous occasions in which many came to his house and there was some type of controversy. On the first occasion (2:1-12) Jesus encountered criticism from "some of the scribes" when he healed and forgave the sins of the paralytic, and on the second occasion (3:20-21) when the crowd gathered around Jesus, his friends went out to seize him because they said, "He is beside himself." This leads to the second statement which was surely added by the Evangelist--that a prophet is rejected "among his own kin." This addition relates back to 3:21 where already Jesus' friends think that Jesus is beside himself and to 3:31-35 where a tension is introduced between Jesus and his family. Of course the point of the addition is to assert that Jesus is rejected not only in his own country but among his own closest relatives.[1] But the relationship of Jesus to his family is not only inserted into this paragraph by this phrase in 6:4 but also by placing 6:3 into the unit.

---

[1] E. Preuschen, "Das Wort vom verachten Propheten," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XVII (1916), 41-48; Wendling, Entstehung, p. 54.

[2] Preuschen, "Wort," pp. 40-42.

In vs. 3 of this unit there is a detailed listing of Jesus' family. B. W. Bacon noticed that only here and in 3:31-35 are Jesus' kindred mentioned in the Marcan Gospel, and in each instance "they appear simply as examples of the unbelief of 'his own.'"[2] For our purposes it is important to notice that 6:3 is essentially a doublet of 3:21, 31-35.[3] The Evangelist has undoubtedly used a traditional listing of the brothers, but he has so placed these materials to attain a particularly derisive effect. The placing of this tradition about Jesus' mother, brothers, and sisters in the midst of a unit depicting the rejection of Jesus by the people in his patris, brings attention to the other place in which they are mentioned--when they did not understand him or accept his actions (3:21, 31-35). In addition, the references to Jesus as

---

[1] The Evangelist has used the phrase en tois suggeneusin autou to state the rejection of Jesus by his own kinfolk. The double saying in Pap. Oxyrh. 6 (par. Gosp. Thom. 31) has in the second part that a healer cannot heal eis tous geinōskontas auton and could well be the form of the tradition which suggested the use of suggeneusin to the writer of Mark since he uses it in no other place in his Gospel (so Wendling and Bultmann).

[2] Bacon, Gospel Story, p. 36. [3] Wendling, Entstehung, pp. 53-54.

"the carpenter" and "son of Mary" may be meant to be derogatory in their formulation.[1] In this context the reference to the carpenter seems to be a snide remark that as such they certainly wouldn't expect him to have the right to perform mighty works, and it is possible that the designation of Jesus by a reference to his mother may be considered by a Jewish writer to be a form of humiliation within a Jewish community.[2]

A new feature has been introduced into the narrative by this unit--the statement that Jesus is a prophet. Perhaps this would remain unimportant (the significance of it has hardly been noticed), except that Jesus has not been called a prophet in the narrative until this point[3] and that the word then occurs with reference to Jesus in 6:15, and in 8:28, i.e. within the next transitional unit in the Gospel. This next section in Mark deals with Jesus' relationship to the Jews and whether he is a prophet or finally "the Christ" (8:29). Thus it is not accidental that Bacon noticed that "6:1-6 represents a change of viewpoint from that of the teacher to that of the anti-Jewish apologist."[4] While 3:7-12 is a transitional unit which binds together its succeeding and preceding sections through the exorcisms and the title Son of God, 6:1-6 represents a change from Son of God to the rejected prophet and a change from Galilean ministry to direct controversy over the laws of Judaism and a ministry which includes both Jewish and non-Jewish peoples.

---

[1] W. K. L. Clarke, New Testament Problems (London: S. P. C. K., 1929), pp. 31-32; Lightfoot, History, pp. 187-88.

[2] Ibid.

[3] In Mark 1:2 the Old Testament quotation is taken from "Isaiah the prophet"--that is the only occurrence of the word before 6:4.

[4] Bacon, Gospel Story, p. 37.

But even as this change is made a new height of power is recognized in Jesus. In vss. 2, 4 the Evangelist has used the word dunamis in a more mechanical, magical application and carried it out in 6:14.[1] Thus even as the theme of Jesus' rejection becomes part of the Christological statement, the theme of the power within Jesus is elevated. There is no doubt that the rejected Jesus will have power to overcome the fate which is set for him. This is perhaps also testified by the raising of the ruler's daughter from death to life (5:35-43) just prior to this statement of the rejection (6:1-6). The purpose surely has been to affirm so strongly the power and authority of Jesus that, even though he is rejected and killed, it will be understood why he was triumphant over sin and death.

Thus the investigation of Mark 6:1-6 indicates that this unit was constructed by the Evangelist for the purpose of fusing the theme of rejection into the image of Jesus in the narrative through application of the title prophet to Jesus. Vs. 1 was constructed as a connecting sentence on the basis of the saying in 6:4-5. Vs. 2, the last entrance of Jesus into a synagogue, has been constructed as a parallel to his first teaching and healing in a synagogue (1:21-28). In vs. 3 the Evangelist has placed a traditional listing of Jesus' family into a scene of rejection, thus bringing into this unit of rejection the theme of Jesus' disunity with his family which was introduced in 3:21, 31-35. In vss. 4-5 the Evangelist uses the prophet saying to point forward to Jesus' rejection by the disciples and the Jewish leaders. Finally vs. 6 has been composed to characterize the intensity of the rejection of his people. In this way the unit was constructed to be a transition in the narrative in which the image of Jesus was changed from the ever more powerful healer to the prophet-healer rejected by his own people.

---

[1] Wendling, Entstehung, p. 59.

The Rejected Prophet-Healer

We must now attempt to establish to what extent the Evangelist has used an established prophet-rejection tradition and discuss the import of this characterization of Jesus in this section of the Gospel. The history of the tradition of the rejected prophet is extremely difficult to assess. It has been complicated in at least two ways. (a) Palestinian Jewish traditions speak of a prophet who would arise in the New Age. It is often difficult to decide if a specific prophet known from Israel's past has given the impetus to a tradition or if simply a general expectation has caused its formulation. Analysis of these traditions centers on the identity and the function of the prophet who is expected.[1] (b) Certain prophets were killed. This has led to investigations of the martyr-prophets and varied assessments of the relation of the martyrdom concept to prophet traditions at the beginning of the Christian era.[2]

The concept of the eschatological prophet undoubtedly influenced the traditions of John the Baptist and Jesus.[3] Primarily traditions concerning two prophets, Moses and Elijah, were used to interpret their activities. In many instances, however, the influences have come in during various stages of transmission and it is difficult to determine if the tradition indicates the expectation of a Second Moses or a Moses *redivivus* (not exactly the same), a New Elijah or Elijah *redivivus*, or simply a general view that a special prophet would arise in the New Age. It seems correct to conclude that the view of Jesus as a Mosaic eschatological prophet has given impetus to the traditions of his feeding 4,000 and 5,000 people in the wilderness (Mark 6:35-44; 8:1-10) and the transfiguration in Mark which includes an allusion to Deut. 18:15 (Mark 9:2-8).[1] Jesus' Raising of Jairus' Daughter in Mark 5:21-24, 35-43 points to Jesus as an eschatological Elijah who can raise a child from the dead as Elijah did in the past (I Kings 17:17-24). For our investigation, we notice that whether related to Moses or Elijah these do not contain the idea of rejection or death of the prophet.

---

[1] Howard M. Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet, Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, Vol. X (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957), pp. 1-11, 100-21.

[2] Hans J. Schoeps, "Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde," Aus frühchristlicher Zeit: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, Symbolae Biblicae Upsaliensis, No. 2 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1950), pp. 126-43.

[3] Hahn, Titles, pp. 352-88.

In the discussions of the martyr-prophets a distinction has been drawn between the traditions which either include or exclude the concept of atoning death.[2] Recently an analysis has differentiated between traditions which focus upon the martyrdom of prophets and those which focus upon the rejection of the prophets (during their life). Odil H.

---

[1] Hahn, *Titles*, pp. 379-80, 382-83; Teeple, *Prophet*, pp. 84-86.

[2] Eduard Lohse, *Martyrer und Gottesknecht: Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom sühntod Jesu Christi*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 64 [New Series, 46] (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1955).

Steck, in Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten,[1] has argued for this distinction and carefully presented the history of the rejection of the prophets in Israel, Judaism, and early Christianity. The result is a persuasive thesis that alongside of the martyr-prophet traditions there arose in the Deuteronomic scheme of Israel's history the tradition of Israel's rejection of the prophets.[2] This tradition lived on in Judaism and was taken up by early Christianity.[3]

Our interest in this tradition of Israel's rejection of the prophets lies in the Evangelist's use of such a tradition to interconnect his account of Jesus' healing ministry with his view of Jesus as the suffering, rejected, killed, and rising Son of man. The prophet saying in Mark 6:4 represents the kind of circulating tradition which alluded to the inherent rejection of the prophets within Israel. When it stood as one part of a double saying concerning the prophet-healer it could be used in the context of a healing narrative. The Evangelist introduced this rejection tradition to bring Jesus' successful ministry into alignment with his eventual "deliverance up" and his death. While by this means the Evangelist designates Jesus as a rejected prophet-healer, for him the Baptist is the rejected prophet par excellence, but through the Baptist's rejection and death we are given insight into the fate of Jesus. The

---

[1] Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 23 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967).

[2] See the review of this book by John H. Elliott in Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVII (1968), 226-27.

[3] Steck, Das gewaltsame Geschick, p. 244.

Evangelist has carried this contrapuntal theme of the Baptist's fate into this section by recounting the death of the Baptist in the first episode after the disciple paragraph (6:7-13) which in the Marcan scheme immediately follows a transitional unit. The Evangelist links the Baptist's fate with the rejection of Jesus by prefacing the narrative with a discussion of Herod's view of Jesus. Herod thinks that Jesus may have been the Baptist raised from the dead so that the Baptist's powers are energized in him, but others disagreed with Herod saying that Jesus was Elijah or a prophet (6:14-15). With this editorial discussion the Evangelist has firmly planted the image of Jesus as the rejected prophet-healer within this section and interwoven it with the Baptist's fate. When he refocuses the image of Jesus from the rejected prophet-healer to the suffering, rejected, killed and rising Son of man, this same discussion of Jesus' identity stands before the new title is introduced (8:27-28).

As Burkill has shown, the remaining narratives in this section have been arranged by the Evangelist to contrast Jesus' rejection by the Jewish leaders and his acceptance by the general population.[1] Thus, after Jesus is well received in 6:31-56 where he successfully feeds the 5,000 (6:30-44), walks on the water (6:45-52), and heals the sick in Gennesaret (6:53-56), the Jewish leaders directly oppose him (7:1-24). In the dialogue between Jesus and the leaders, Isa. 29:13 is brought forward (7:6-7) to combat the Jewish position. Various passages from

---

[1] T. A. Burkill, "Mark 6:31-8:26: The Context of the Story of the Syrophoenician Woman," The Classical Tradition. Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan, ed. by Luitpold Wallach (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966), pp. 329-44.

Isaiah had become a prominent part of the early Church's explanation for the Jews' rejection of Jesus and the Christian message.[1] This dialogue with this scriptural passage in it may have been especially attractive to the Evangelist for its use of timaō--"this people honors me with their lips, but their heart is far from me . . ." This rejection of God informs the "dishonor" which comes to the prophet-healer in his own country, in his own house, and among his kinfolk (6:4). In 7:1-24, then, the Evangelist has depicted the growing opposition between Jesus and the Jewish leaders. Though they honor God with their lips, they reject his commandments and dishonor the prophet-healer in their own country.

In contrast to this rejection, a Gentile woman (Syro-Phoenician) displays her proper understanding and belief in Jesus and the correct understanding of her Gentile position before God's saving activity, and Jesus heals her daughter (7:24-30). Again, Jesus is praised as he heals a deaf and dumb man (7:31-37) and feeds the 4,000 (8:1-10), but the Pharisees again oppose him, seeking a sign (8:11-13), so that Jesus warns against the Jewish leaders and the Herodians who have killed the Baptist (8:14-21).[2]

In addition, the Evangelist depicts the disciples' increasing lack of understanding in this section. This motif had been introduced in 4:13

---

[1] Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 159-67.

[2] Notice that while the Evangelist includes opposition from the Herodians, he shows that Herod was tricked into killing the Baptist, and Pilate, in the passion narrative, has no choice in the face of Jewish pressure but to have Jesus crucified; cf. Burkill, "Mark 6:31-8:26," p. 333.

when the disciples could not understand the parable of the Sower. But in this section the disciples' failure to understand becomes increasingly noticeable. Accordingly, the disciples do not understand Jesus' feeding of the 5,000 (6:35-37, 52), his debate with the Pharisees (7:17-18), nor his feeding of the 4,000 (8:4, 14-21). Weeden has suggested that this motif is part of the means by which the Evangelist sets a true Christology on the lips of Jesus and combats a false Christology which these disciples hold.[1] In this section the constant failure of the disciples to understand contributes to the image of Jesus as the rejected prophet-healer--even his closest disciples do not understand nor accept him, and finally they will flee and deny him.

Mark 8:27-33

Mark 8:27-33 contains the most vivid and noticeable Christological transition in the Gospel of Mark:

> [27]And Jesus went on with his disciples, to the villages of Caesarea Philippi; and on the way he asked his disciples, "Who do men say that I am?" [28]And they told him, "John the Baptist; and others say, Elijah; and others one of the prophets." [29]And he asked them, "But who do you say that I am?" Peter answered him, "You are the Christ." [30]And he charged them to tell no one about him. [31]And he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. [32]And he said this plainly. And Peter took him, and began to rebuke him. [33]But turning and seeing his disciples, he rebuked Peter, and said, "Get behind me, Satan! For you are not on the side of God, but of men."

Many have noticed that in this unit the Evangelist portrays Jesus as beginning to teach that the Son of man must be rejected, be killed, and rise after three days; it is often not so clearly noticed that this unit also summarizes the image of Jesus in the previous section (Jesus is viewed by many as John the Baptist, Elijah, or one of the prophets [6:14-15]) and gives a climactic Christological ending to that section in Peter's confession (as the one who confronts the Jews and feeds the multitudes, Jesus is the Christ). This paragraph forms a full-scale transition within the narrative from the acclamation of Jesus in a typical Jewish setting, through a typical disciple's confession that Jesus is the Messiah, to the understanding of Jesus which the Evangelist considers to be of prime importance--the rejected-rising Son of man. In this paragraph, then, the Christological themes themselves form the transition from the preceding section to the following section.

---

[1] Theodore J. Weeden, "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LIX (1968), 145-58, esp. 145-47.

The distinction between tradition and redaction in this pericope leaves little doubt that the final form shows distinctive Marcan emphases. Whereas in Matthew a new section is begun at 16:21 with the discussion about the Son of man, the Marcan unit correlates Peter's confession about Jesus as the Christ with the prediction of the suffering, dying, and rising of the Son of man.[1] There is disagreement among scholars concerning the unity of the traditional units prior to their fusion into this Marcan tradition,[2] but whether the pre-Marcan tradition was made up of individual units (of which one was the passion prediction in 8:31) or whether one connected tradition stood behind the present Marcan production in 8:27-33 (so recently Strecker), the Evangelist transformed this tradition into a pivotal Christological statement in the center of his Gospel.[1]

---

[1] E. g., Hahn, Titles, p. 223; Ulrich Luz, "Das Geheimnismotiv und die markinische Christologie," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LVI (1965), 22.

[2] Cf. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, pp. 257-59; A. Vögtle, "Messiasbekenntnis und Petrusverheissung," Biblische Zeitschrift, I (1957), 252-72; II (1958), 85-103; Hahn, Titles, pp. 223-26; Ernst Haenchen, "Die Komposition von Mk. 8.27-9.1 und Par.," Novum Testamentum, VI (1963), 81-109; Erich Dinkler, "Petrusbekenntnis und Satanswort. Das Problem der Messianität Jesu," Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1964), pp. 127-53; Luz, "Geheimnismotiv," pp. 20-26; Strecker, "Die Leidens," pp. 16-39.

First of all, vs. 30 is unanimously agreed to be a composition of the Evangelist since its content is that of the messianic secret. Its precise function is disputed, but that it is redactional is evident.

Secondly, vs. 31 has long been considered to be an independent tradition which was inserted into this pericope by the Marcan Evangelist.[2] Recently, however, G. Strecker has suggested that this verse was part of the pre-Marcan unit without the title Son of man and the phrase polla pathein.[3] This verse will require special inquiry and discussion.

Thirdly, vs. 32a is redactional. In contrast to the many previous items which Jesus has told "in parables," he now speaks "openly" to the disciples that the Son of man must suffer, die, and rise after three days. There is no dispute that this speaking openly in contrast to the theme of speaking in parables is a Marcan development.

The remaining verses, 27-29 and 32b-33, present the real difficulty. The problem is to ascertain how much of these verses was a unified pre-Marcan tradition. Strecker has asserted that all of these verses plus the passion prediction in vs. 31 (minus Son of man and polla pathein) existed as an oral pre-Marcan unity.[4] The entire pericope now exists in a Marcan stylized fashion because the Evangelist received it in an oral form and then wrote it down. This oral tradition arose within Hellenistic Christianity and was designed to counter the possible Jewish conception of a Messiah who was a national hero with a Messiah who went through the passion and death to be raised from the dead.[1] These verses, 27-29, 31, 32b-33, present a tradition without any gaps and, further, it eases the problem of the rejection of Peter. The Satan word in this longer pre-Marcan tradition need not be considered to be anti-Petrine; rather, Peter simply represents the type of the misunderstanding Christian who has not grasped the divine necessity of the suffering and death of the Messiah.[2]

---

[1] Cf. Hahn, Titles, pp. 225-26.

[2] See one of the earlier discussions of this in Dibelius, Tradition, pp. 115, 225-26.

[3] Strecker, "Die Leidens," pp. 16-39. [4] Ibid., pp. 32-33.

In contrast, Ferd. Hahn views the double introduction in vs. 27 as furnishing the key for understanding the pre-Marcan traditions. The first introduction in vs. 27a, "And Jesus went on with his disciples, to the villages of Caesarea Philippi," is the opening statement of a biographical apophthegm which was constructed around the fragments now found in vss. 27a, 29b, 33. The existence of this apophthegm in the tradition is supported by the influence of its structure upon John 6:66-71. The same biographical apophthegm stands behind both traditions and is to be seen as an independent oral tradition in which the disciples were following Jesus, Peter confesses Jesus' messianic status, and Jesus speaks a word about Satan to Peter.[3] The second introduction in vs. 27b, "And on the way he asked his disciples, "Who do men say that I am?", introduces a Schulgespräch now preserved in vss. 27b-29. This tradition represents a situation of Jesus teaching his disciples socratically by asking them questions which lead them to the proper answer.[1] In this tradition the messianic title is held in much higher esteem than in the biographical apophthegm and the confession of that title forms the climactic statement of the story.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 33-34. [2] Ibid.

[3] Hahn, Titles, pp. 224-25.

Luz, in an article on the messianic secret and the Marcan Christology, disagrees with Hahn's suggestion that vss. 27a, 29b, 33 represent fragments of a biographical apophthegm, but in a footnote he asserts in detail that vss. 27b-29 (the Schulgespräch isolated by Hahn) represent an old Aramaic tradition.[2] This assertion is especially relevant for our investigation since vss. 27b-29 represent a doublet of 6:14b-16. As in 3:7-12 and 6:1-6, this unit contains within it a doublet of an episode in the preceding narrative which has claim to be an earlier independent tradition.

Before deciding finally upon 27a, 29b, 33 we must discuss the passion prediction, vs. 31, in the unit. It is well known that Mark 8:31 is one of three passion predictions found in the Gospel of Mark (the other two stand at 9:31 and 10:32-34). Dibelius maintained that all three of these are fragments of tradition which "stand almost without connection in the narrative, . . ." and "that they were introduced by the collecting evangelist . . ." as can be seen "from their regular distribution in chapters viii-x."[3] Bultmann suggested further that these passion predictions are statements of the passion kerygma which contain the basic outline which furnishes the coherence to the passion narrative.[1] Since each of the predictions varies slightly from the others, the ensuing discussion was that of ascertaining which represents the earliest form and which ones, consequently, are later expansions dependent on the earlier form. Prior to Tödt, Michaelis and Lohmeyer had suggested that the earliest form of this tradition was represented by a two-member saying, "to suffer many things and be rejected."[2] The basis for this was the existence of this phrase independently in Luke 17:25. Tödt, in his investigation of these traditions, has destroyed this view. He has shown that Luke 17:25 participates in a Lucan redactional _Tendenz_ which leads to the abbreviation of these passion predictions as they are incorporated into the Lucan narrative.[3] When one accepts this criticism, and Tödt's analysis is compelling, the _Sitz-im-Leben_ of 8:31 in the tradition must be re-established. Strecker, arising to this occasion, has suggested that 8:31 existed within a tradition in which the rejection of the Messiah was discussed with the disciples. Hence, he suggests that 8:31 was an integral part of the tradition represented by Mark 8:27-29, 32b-33. Having taken this step, he argues that 9:31 and 10:32-34 were developed in analogy to this verse and with an eye toward the passion narrative. Mark 9:31 and 10:32-34, therefore, are dependent upon 8:31, and their variation is due to the addition or substitution of elements from the passion narrative tradition.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 223-24. [2] Luz, "Geheimnismotiv," pp. 21-22, n. 60.

[3] Dibelius, Tradition, pp. 225-26.

---

[1] Bultmann, _Synoptic Tradition_, p. 275.

[2] Lohmeyer, _Markus_, p. 165; W. Michaelis, "_paschō_," _Theological Dictionary of the New Testament_, Vol. V, trans. by G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), 914-15; Tödt, _Son of Man_, pp. 162-63.

[3] Tödt, _Son of Man_, pp. 163-64; see the further discussion of its function in the Lucan theology in Robert Maddox, "The Function of the Son of Man According to the Synoptic Gospels," _New Testament Studies_, XV (1968), 50-53.

The strength of Strecker's work lies in his explanation of the narrative movement toward the passion narrative in chapters 8, 9, and 10. He has not, however, remained alert to the movement "backwards" from the passion kerygma in the redaction of these traditions. An analysis of these traditions must reckon with the fundamental fact that 8:31 speaks of suffering and rejection (*apodokimazō*) while both 9:31 and 10:32-34 speak of "being delivered up" (*paradidōmi*). Mark 9:31 and 10:32-34 represent a variant tradition, a *paradidōmi* tradition, which stands in contrast to 8:31 which uses *apodokimazō*. The only part of 9:31 which is directly related to 8:31 is the introductory statement, "he began to teach his disciples and said to them," and the concluding phrase, "and having been killed, after three days he shall rise up." In the former instance we simply have a Marcan form of a connecting introduction, and the latter phrase is most probably dependent upon 9:31, given the early status of that saying independently from the passion narrative.[2] Mark 10:32-34 represents a tradition which grew up in direct connection with the passion narrative, thus it includes the definite steps of the sequence of events. This is indicated by the deliverance over to the chief priest and the scribes who then condemn him to death, then he is delivered to the Gentiles and they mock him, spit upon him, scourge him, and kill him, and after three days he rises up. The last part of 10:32-34 is dependent upon 9:31 for *apoktenousin* and *anastēsetai* rather than dependent upon 8:31. In addition, 10:32-34 stands in connection with the paradidōmi traditions in 14:21, 41 rather than the apodokimazō tradition represented by 8:31; 9:12; 12:10.

---

[1] Strecker, "Die Leidens," pp. 24-34.

[2] Tödt, *Son of Man*, pp. 160, 177, 201.

Strecker is right in maintaining that the paradidōmi terminology in 9:31 and 10:32-34 derives from the passion kerygma. What remains for mention is that the prediction in 8:31 has variant terminology which stands as the connecting saying between the rejection tradition and the "delivering up" traditions. Strecker's contention that 8:31 must have had a context in a tradition close to the Caesarea Philippi pericope is not confirmed. His suggestion that the Evangelist has added the title Son of man and polla pathein to 8:31, however, is to be held as highly possible. The probability is that the Evangelist has added this to 8:31 on the basis of its existence in 9:12 which, as Tödt has strongly argued,[1] must have been a "ready formed pronouncement about the Son of man." This is surely the case, since 9:12 contains the alternative word in the tradition, exoudeneō, rather than apodokimazō, the verb which is used in 8:31 and stands in the scriptural tradition from Ps. 118:22 in Mark 12:10.

This means that it is most likely that 8:31 represents a saying constructed by the Evangelist on analogy with 9:31 but using suffering-rejection terminology to interconnect the preceding rejection with the succeeding "delivering up." Hence this saying stands as a transitional saying which gains support in the descent after the transfiguration (9:12), but then leads to the two paradidōmi passion predictions in 9:31 and 10:32-34. The Evangelist's insertion strengthens the possibility that he used for the base of his unit a biographical apophthegm which had been given a location in Caesarea Philippi, then he inserted the tradition into it which is now found in vss. 27b-29. This formation of the unit would be analogous to the construction of 6:1-6 by the Evangelist: into a tradition of Jesus teaching in a synagogue are placed independent traditions, one which connects back to the rejection of his family and one which introduces the characterization of Jesus as a rejected prophet. In 8:27-33, into a tradition of a disciples' confession of Jesus' messianic status, the Evangelist has inserted two independent traditions--one which connects back to the identity of Jesus as a prophet and one which introduces the image of Jesus as the suffering Son of man. The result is that three of the transitional units, 3:7-12; 6:1-6; 8:27-33, share in the same editorial structure: first, there is a sentence or phrase which links the unit geographically into the narrative (3:7a; 6:1; 8:27a); secondly, there stands a tradition which recalls a situation in the previous narrative (3:7b-8; 6:2-3; 8:27b-30); and thirdly, a Christological title is introduced which leads to the succeeding narrative (3:9-12; 6:4-6; 8:31-33). Whereas the correlation of Peter's confession and the passion prediction is the peculiar characteristic of this Marcan pericope,[1] the function of this unit in the further expanse of the narrative is to be found on a broader level. The fact of Jesus' being killed was most easily connected with his authoritative and highly acclaimed ministry not by the theme of his "being delivered up" (paradidōmi) but by the theme of rejection (apodokimazō). This has led the Evangelist to place in his paragraph, which forms the transition from Jesus as the rejected prophet-healer to the Son of man who is "delivered up," a saying about the Son of man who is "rejected." The "being delivered up" traditions are interconnected with Jesus' ministry most clearly through the contrapuntal story of the fate of the Baptist's ministry (1:14; 6:14-29), but the "rejection" traditions furnished the means by which he interconnected the healing ministry with the "delivered up" traditions.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 167-69.

---

[1] Cf. Hahn, Titles, p. 223.

The Rejected-Rising Son of Man

The theme of rejection achieves a Christological status when it becomes an integral part of Jesus' activity which informs the later Church's confession and action. The Marcan narrative does not progress on an explicitly Christological level of presentation as does the fourth Gospel. Instead, it moves toward climactic statements in the narrative which bring Jesus' activity to focal points of Christological confession. These confessions arise out of the community's reflections upon Jesus' activities. Those activities which aid this later community in its belief because they are applicable to their later situation gain importance until they become part of the Christological confession of that community.

The movement of the Marcan narrative itself indicates to us how Christological confessions could be introduced into narrative proclamations. In the beginning of the Marcan narrative Jesus is the authoritative healer-teacher; on certain occasions people oppose his activities. This authoritative and powerful healing ministry attains the level of Christological confession ("You are the Son of God," 3:11; 5:7). In Mark 6:1-6 the opposition to Jesus is shown to be an integral aspect of Jesus' activities--he is the rejected prophet-healer. The rejected prophet-healer's activity informs the later believer that his ministry will include rejection, suffering, and, perhaps, even death. The activity of the rejected prophet-healer reaches the status of Christological importance in "the Son of man must suffer many things, be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes and be killed, and after three days rise again" (8:31). In this saying the Christological confession, "You are the Son of man," remains implicit. Never in extant materials, however, does the Son of man title become confessional in this way. The Christological conception lies in Jesus' designation of himself as Son of man. The rejection and death of Jesus has been incorporated into the title Son of man and placed on the lips of Jesus. The community now perceives the Son of man as "he who suffered, was rejected and killed, and after three days arose"; with the integration of this rejection and this title the stage is set for further Christological reflection. The result of this reflection stands in Mark 10:45, where the rejection and death is an atonement for the sins of many. Again, however, the concept of suffering does not reach the stage of confession in connection with the title Son of man. The Christological confession including suffering emerges in 15:39--from a Gentile, and with the title Son of God.

In order to understand the Christological implication of the Marcan Evangelist's introduction of the title Son of man into the narrative in this way, it is necessary to see his systematic placing of the Son of man sayings in this section. After 8:31, a Son of man saying stands at 8:38; 9:9, 12; 9:31; 10:33; 10:45.

First of all, the Evangelist, as in the previous sections, directs his narrative to discipleship immediately after the transitional paragraph. He uses the Christological title Son of man as the key-word for integrally connecting discipleship with the image of Jesus in the composition of his narrative. As he does this, he juxtaposes discipleship sayings (8:34-37), a saying about the parousia of the Son of man (8:38), and a saying about the disciples' relation to the kingdom of God (9:1). The import of this juxtaposition of sayings immediately after the transitional unit in 8:27-33 has been presented ty Tödt.[1] By it, the Evangelist established a fixed connection between the disciples' entering into the kingdom and their following of the rejected and rising Son of man. The Evangelist expanded this concern with discipleship into a threefold patterned progression by regularly introducing after 9:31 and 10:32-34 teaching which answers questions on discipleship which the disciples raise in their disputes with one another.[2]

But, secondly, the Evangelist did not stop with the section on discipleship in 8:34-9:1. Much as in 6:14-29 he interposes, after the discipleship unit, a story which works the title into a context where the contrapuntal ministry of the Baptist is once again introduced. This time the episode focuses upon Jesus proclaimed to be Son of God at a transfiguration. After that the episode is discussed and the disciples are told that the people did with the Baptist whatever they wished (killed him) just as the Son of man must suffer many things, be rejected, and rise again.

The third part of this section after the transitional unit (8:27-33) shows Jesus healing a boy so severely possessed by an unclean spirit that the disciples could not cast it out (9:14-29). This healing and the healing of the blind Bartimaeus (10:46-52) are the only two healing episodes in Mark after the Caesarea Philippi pericope. The latter healing narrative introduces the confession of Jesus as Son of David; the former was so placed that the power of Jesus to heal confirms his power to rise as Son of man.

---

[1] Tödt, Son of Man, pp. 145-47.

[2] Cf. Keck, "Introduction," p. 363.

This interpretation of the healing in Mark 9:14-29 requires support and leads to elaboration. The support for saying that Jesus' power to heal the epileptic boy confirms his power to rise as Son of man, lies in the position which the Evangelist gave it in between the transfiguration and the second passion prediction. In this position, the power of Jesus to raise him (*ēgeiren auton*) so that he rises up (*anestē*) after he was as if dead so that many said that he had died, contains an obvious relationship to Jesus' next statement in 9:31 that "having been killed he will rise up after three days,"[1] and to his statement in the preceding episode (9:9) that the Son of man would rise from the dead (*ek nekrōn anastē*). Thus it is that, as Robinson has said, "Jesus' cure of the epileptic boy is described in terms of resurrection (9:27, cf. 5:41f.)."[2] This healing mirrors the power of Jesus to rise from the dead by reasserting Jesus' power to raise another from the dead. This had been established at the climax of the miracle section when Jesus raised Jairus' daughter from the dead (5:41-42), but now it is reinforced in a section where Jesus' rejection and death has been fully incorporated within his ministry. Thus one can see the authoritative healing ministry of Jesus supporting the conception of his power to "rise from the dead after three days."

---

[1] Schweizer, *Markus*, p. 107.

[2] Robinson, *Problem*, p. 39.

This now brings us to discuss the two stories in the healing ministry in Mark where the title Son of man occurs--2:10; 2:28. In these two passages, the exousia of the Son of man in his ministry is stressed in Jesus' authority to forgive sins and to abrogate the sabbath law. First of all, the connection of the word exousia with the earthly activity of the Son of man is Marcan.[1] Never "in the synoptic tradition except in Mark or in dependence upon Mark"[2] is this authority given explicit expression, even though it be implicit in the tradition outside of Mark. Secondly, these sayings occur in a section in which Jesus' authority is being established at the outset of his ministry as his calling to discipleship is immediately heeded (1:18, 20; 2:14), his teaching has authority, and not as the scribes (1:22), and his exorcisms are considered new teaching with authority (1:27).[3] While it is not possible to know if the Evangelist has created these sayings or acquired them from the tradition, it is clear that while the Son of man sayings occur here in the ministry, they lead up to a confession of him as Son of God in the earthly ministry.

When, in the section in which the title Son of man has been firmly established as the title depicting Jesus as the rejected-rising One, the Evangelist relates the healing in Mark 9:14-29 which Jesus alone can do, the authoritative healing ministry is in one more way correlated with the Son of man title.

---

[1] Norman Perrin, "The Creative Use Of the Son of Man Traditions by Mark," Union Seminary Quarterly Review, XXIII (1968), 361.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

Up to this point in the Marcan narrative Jesus is depicted as the authoritative healer who is rejected and will rise again, and not once has his "deliverance up" been referred to--John the Baptist has been delivered up and killed, Jesus' rejection, death, and rising up has been introduced, but not his "deliverance up." In 9:31 for the first time is Jesus' "being delivered up" brought into the narrative--in it the passion terminology _par excellence_ has been introduced. In 10:32-34 the double "delivering up" is expressed and the individual people involved are indicated. In 10:45 a new element comes to expression: the Son of man is not only to be "followed" to his death and resurrection, but his entire ministry as Son of man is "a ransom for many." Toward this Christological highpoint, that the Son of man's death furnishes the means of salvation, the Marcan narrative has carefully moved. Again, this is a Christological statement toward which the narrative has moved, not the one on which the Gospel material itself was first formulated.

Mark 10:46-52 and 13:1-37

Through the units, 10:46-52 and 13:1-37, the Evangelist clarifies the relation of the Jerusalemite traditions and the belief in Jesus as Son of man, and he interconnects the Christological consequences for discipleship with the passion narrative.

Mark 10:46-52 introduces the title Son of David and portrays the blind man who confessed Jesus as Son of David as following in the way of discipleship. This title of authority remains close to Jesus during his controversial actions and teachings in Jerusalem. This title undergirds his authority in Jerusalem and is the foundation from which he issues a devastating criticism against Judaism and its leaders.

In 13:1-37 the coming Son of man is discussed in relation to the persecution which the believers in the Evangelist's Church are experiencing, and the scene points forward to the Gethsemane episode where Jesus comes and finds his disciples sleeping and is "delivered up into the hands of sinners." The coming Son of man is thus correlated with the "delivered up" Son of man through the command to the disciples to watch and remain steadfast during their times of "being delivered up."

Each unit, 10:46-52 and 13:1-37, functions as a transitional unit which introduces a title in reference to Jesus' function in the later community. In them the last phase of the interconnection of Jesus' ministry with the passion narrative is effected and the Christological implications of these Jerusalem activities for discipleship are developed in their final form.

Mark 10:46-52

In Mark 10:46-52, the healing of blind Bartimaeus, we encounter the transitional unit in which the title Son of David is introduced into the narrative.

> [46]And they came to Jericho; and as he was leaving Jericho with his disciples and a great multitude, Bartimaeus, a blind beggar, the son of Timaeus, was sitting by the roadside. [47]And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out and say, "Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me!" [48]And many rebuked him, telling him to be silent; but he cried out all the more, "Son of David, have mercy on me.'" [49]And Jesus stopped and said, "Call him." And they called the blind man, saying to him, "Take heart; rise, he is calling you." [50]And throwing off his mantle he sprang up and came to Jesus. [51]And Jesus said to him, "What do you want me to do for you?" And the blind man said to him, "Master let me receive my sight." [52]And Jesus said to him, "Go your way; your faith has made you well." And immediately he received his sight and followed him on the way.

Again, the transitional character of this unit becomes apparent, first of all, through the disagreement of previous scholars on the section to which it belongs. On the one hand, B. Weiss asserted in 1872 that this pericope introduced the section 10:46-13:37, which portrayed Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem and his pre-passion activity there.[1] On the other hand, scholars such as J. Wellhausen[2] and E. Klostermann[3] began to treat 10:46-52 as the conclusion to the previous section which depicted Jesus "on the way to Jerusalem." B. W. Bacon followed this latter division which placed 10:46-52 at the end of the previous section, but of the six divisions which he saw in the Gospel, about this one he said:

> . . . In the single case of the terminus of Division IV Part Second [8:27-10:52] there might be doubt. The subject of the Division is sustained until 10:45 and reaches there an admirable climax, while the appended healing of Bartimaeus is at all events an epilogue forming a transition to the next Division, with which some excellent authorities have grouped it. Our first evangelist [Matthew], however, marks the transition at 11:1, and we have followed this example.[4]

In this instance, as others, it is necessary to depend upon the narrative in Mark to determine the character of the divisions rather than the Matthean Evangelist's use of Mark. Bacon properly identified the paragraph as "a transition," but then he depended upon another synoptic Gospel to determine the sectional division in Mark.

The distinction between tradition and redaction in this unit leaves us with a story of the healing of a blind man who addresses Jesus as Son of David and an editorial comment that "immediately he received his sight and followed him on the way."

---

[1] Das Markusevangelium (Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1872), p. 358.

[2] Wellhausen, Marci, pp. 85-86. [3] Klostermann, Markusevangelium.

[4] Bacon, Beginnings, p. xviii.

With regard to the story, Dibelius listed it with the paradigms of a "less pure type."[1] For this reason it reaches its high point, not in the success of the miracle (as in a Tale), but in "the proof and the consequence of faith."[2] Taylor, in response to Dibelius' analysis, notices that the Evangelist has hardly told this story here to record a mighty work which illustrates the importance of faith. He "records it primarily because of its Messianic character as a preparation for the story of the Entry (11.1-11) . . ."[3] With this observation by Taylor we notice that the significant part of the Evangelist's activity with regard to this story was his selection and placement of it at this juncture in his narrative. The most salient feature of the story for the Marcan narrative is the unexpected, twice-repeated address of Jesus by the title Son of David. Nowhere prior to this in the narrative has this title or concept been introduced. After this story, however, the entry into Jerusalem includes the cry, "Blessed is the kingdom of our father David that is coming!", and toward the end of his Temple activities the question of the relation of the Messiah and the Son of David is raised (12:35-37). The title occurs in no other section of Mark; only the Jerusalem activities seem to be understood by the Evangelist as typical "Son of David" activities, and the discussion at the end of this section leaves the impression that Son of David is a subordinate title in the Gospel proclamation which depicts the authoritative status of his Jerusalem activities but informs in only a minor way his positive Christological function in the later community. Hence, the story, included primarily because it contained the twice-repeated title Son of David, was placed here to introduce the title which clarifies Jesus' Jerusalem activity in the succeeding narrative.

---

[1] Dibelius, Tradition, p. 43. [2] Ibid., p. 87.

[3] Taylor, Mark, p. 447.

[4] The name David occurs in the discussion of the showbread in Mark 2:25.

The redactional comment in vs. 52b furnishes the second aspect of the paragraph--its relation to the preceding section. The Evangelist's addition that "immediately (euthus) he received his sight and followed him on the way (en tē hodō)" most probably is meant to indicate that this man accepted discipleship (ēkolouthei autō: see 1:18; 2:14) which means, in the previous section, following Jesus on the way to Jerusalem (8:27; 9:33, 34; 10:32).[1]

The function of this story within the Marcan narrative and the redactional element in it, supports the idea of it as a transitional unit which introduces a Christological title. T. A. Burkill, probably more than anyone else, has heeded the peculiar character of the Marcan narrative at this point. He has noticed that 10:46-52 belongs to the section following it "since it seems to bear a special relation to the account of the triumphal entry, which follows in 11:1ff."[2] Yet, he states, the healing of blind Bartimaeus portrays that "the blind man has sufficient insight and faith to address Jesus as the Son of David and receive healing at his hands"[3] in contrast to the disciples who show no signs of understanding Jesus' teaching about the Son of man in the previous section (8:27-10:45). Thus, "the story of the healing of blind Bartimaeus in 10:46-52 seems to form a connecting link between the second main section of the gospel and the third."[1]

---

[1] See Taylor, Mark, p. 449; Schweizer, "Contribution," p. 428.

[2] Burkill, Mysterious, p. 146. [3] Ibid., p. 186.

Burkill is right in asserting that 10:46-52 is a "connecting link" between two sections in the narrative; we simply prefer, along with B. W. Bacon, the term "transitional unit." It is a transitional unit primarily because it forms a Christological transition from the disciples' following "in the way of the Son of man" (8:27-10:45) toward Jerusalem to the following "in the way of the Son of David" (11:1-12:44) into Jerusalem. For the Evangelist the title Son of David is evidently most applicable to Jesus in his fulfillment of Davidic prophecy in Jerusalem. Therefore, for him, this title accompanies Jesus' activity in that Hallowed City of the Jews.

The Son of David

As has been noticed above, the title Son of David is localized in Mark to the section 10:46-12:44. Two questions arise in the interpretation of such localization by the Evangelist. First of all, the title is applied to Jesus only when he is very near to and within Jerusalem. For the Evangelist, then, this title still contains some relation to Jerusalem as the center of God's activity with the Jewish people. Is the Evangelist interested in suggesting that Jesus was meant to rule as a kingly Messiah? This answer is certainly not to be in the affirmative. Rather, the acclamation of Jesus through "hosanna" during his entry into Jerusalem, which expressed the eschatological expectation of the early Christians, defines Jesus entering into Jerusalem as the Lord who will come in the future. In this way the Evangelist is indicating the authoritative character of this Christ who enters into Jerusalem. The power contained in this image is further depicted in Jesus' entry into the Temple where he casts out the money changers and is feared by the chief priests and the scribes (11:18). This authority is further evident in the teachings of Jesus in response to the questions with regard to his authority in 11:27-33.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 188, cf. p. 186. From this, Burkill argues that the function of 10:46-52 is parallel to that of 8:22-26, the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida (pp. 189-90). While his assertion has claim to validity, it is essential to notice that 8:22-26 is a pre-figuration of the disciples' failure to understand Jesus clearly in 8:27-33 just as the blind man at first does not see clearly. Thus the miracle story in 8:22-26 precedes the unit which explains Jesus' Christological status, while in 10:46-52 the Christological affirmation is part of the story of the healing of the blind Bartimaeus. As a matter of fact, at 10:46-52 for the first time the Evangelist has fused into the transitional unit the problem of understanding (which preceded the prior unit: 8:22-26) and the problem of discipleship (which has systematically followed the transitional units: 1:16-20; 3:13-19; 6:7-13; 8:34-9:1).

A little noticed but significant part of the way by which the Evangelist establishes the authoritative picture of the Son of David in Jerusalem is through the transitional miracle story in which he has introduced the title in 10:46-52. As has been noticed above,[2] this is one of the two healing stories which occur after the confession of Peter outside of Caesarea Philippi. The first healing occurred immediately after the transfiguration when, in our understanding, the raising of the epileptic boy from seeming death to life, placed between two statements that the Son of man would rise from the dead after three days, was a means by which the Evangelist incorporated within the picture of the rejected Jesus the authority which he brought with him to the passion from his ministry. It is instructuve that in this later healing we have the parallel use of such a story from the tradition, except in this instance the concern centers around the authoritative Son of David title within the context of the center of salvation for the Jewish community.

---

[1] Eduard Lohse, History of the Suffering and Death of Jesus Christ, trans. by Martin O. Dietrich (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), pp. 29-34.

[2] Above, p. 130.

The other side of this depiction of Jesus as the Son of David shows itself in the strong polemic of Jesus with the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem. This aspect of the presentation was established within this part of the narrative first through the context of the cursing of the fig tree which the Evangelist places around the cleansing of the Temple.[1] This is immediately heightened by the parable of the Vineyard and the Tenants, where a decisive criticism of the Jewish community, typified by the vineyard, is openly declared by Jesus.

After the parable of the Vineyard, Jesus is shown in three separate pericopes to answer questions put to him respectively by some Pharisees and Herodians, Sadducees, and a scribe (12:13-34). After these episodes, Jesus teaches, on his own initiative, the correlation of the title Christ with the title Son of David, a view which he attributes to the scribes (12:35-37). Wrede argued that in this scene the title Son of David is completely rejected.[2] This interpretation, however, is most likely an overdrawing of the use of the title Son of David in this section in Mark. First of all, as Hahn has argued, the question, "How can the scribes say that the Christ is the Son of David?", is a question concerning the exalted Christ and his connection with the Son of David title. The answer is then given through a quotation of Ps. 110:1 that David himself called him Lord (i.e. the exalted Christ). Thus the titles Christ and Lord are both used to refer to Jesus' messianic enthronement in heaven--his exaltation. The second question then is posed, "Whence is he his Son?", to which there is given no answer. Surely the purpose of this ambiguous ending, in contrast to Hahn, is to suggest that while David has confessed him as Lord, Jesus' sonship comes as much from God's exaltation of him as from David's naming of him. This scene, in which the great crowd hears him gladly, is designed to broaden the understanding of him as Son of God, which is more inclusive.

---

[1] Lohse, Suffering and Death, p. 30.

[2] Cited in Hahn, Titles, pp. 251-52.

This interpretation coheres with the picture of Jesus as the Son of David which is shown to us from the narrative. On the one hand, Jesus' activity in Jerusalem is legitimately to be seen as an authoritative expression of Davidic sonship. In this way Jesus triumphantly enters Jerusalem, clears the Temple, and discusses his authority. On the other hand, the Son of David comes forth with a barage of criticism against Judaism by clearing the outer court of the Temple for the Gentiles, cursing the fig tree, and condemning the vineyard keepers. This authority comes not only from men but from God, but the Evangelist does not wish to say that it has no connection with David. Rather, as in Mark 12:35-37 the source of Jesus' sonship is left open to sonship with David and God, so Jesus would not answer in 11:27-33 whether his authority came from men or from God. Thus, in this section of Mark, the Son of David title is used to underscore Jesus' authoritative action in Jerusalem and to issue a devastating criticism to the Jewish nation which oversees that city and its Temple.

Mark 13:1-37

In Mark 13:1-37 we come to the place in the Marcan narrative where the Evangelist constructed the transitional section which interconnects the Jerusalem activity of Jesus with the passion narrative. At this point in the narrative the Evangelist has produced the transition by rewriting an apocalyptic discourse available to him from the tradition. As with some of the previous transitional units in our discussion, scholars have individually contributed to this understanding of chapter 13, but only a few have actually noticed its transitional function in the overall narrative.

First of all, it is necessary to call attention to the interconnection of this chapter with the preceding and succeeding narrative on a strictly literary level. Mark 13:1-3 shows Jesus coming out of the Temple and sitting on the Mount of Olives opposite the Temple to deliver this apocalyptic discourse. This connection of the chapter with the Temple interconnects it with the preceding section which includes Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, his cleansing of the Temple, and his controversies with the rabbis in the Temple. But, as Busch pointed out in 1938,[1] chapter 13 is really a commentary on Jesus' teaching that the disciples must be prepared to follow in the way of the rejected and destined Son of man. Thus it is interconnected not only with the preceding section but back into the section preceding that, which contains Jesus' teaching about the necessity of following the Son of man who will be delivered up, killed, and will rise again.

---

[1] Friedrich Busch, Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie: Markus 13 neu Untersucht, Neutestamentliche Forschungen, Heft 2 (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1938), p. 53.

However, the literary interconnection of Mark 13 with the succeeding narrative is just as prominent as its interconnection with the preceding narrative. As was pointed out by Lightfoot and re-emphasized later by Dewar,[1] Mark 13 has a definite connection forward with the passion narrative. First of all, in chapter 13 the verb "to deliver up" occurs three times (13:9, 11, 12) and in each instance in reference to the experiences of members of the Church. Especially its occurrence in 13:9: ". . . they will deliver you up to councils; and you will be beaten in synagogues; and you will stand before governors and kings . . ." parallels in an "obvious and striking" way[2] 14:53; 15:10, 15 where Jesus is delivered up to the Jewish and Gentile tribunals. Secondly, the consummation is recounted in 13:24-27: "they will see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory." This represents an obvious parallel to 14:61-62 where, in answer to the high priest's question, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?", Jesus replied, "I am, and you will see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven." As Lightfoot asserted: "there is obviously a tacit identification of the Prisoner with the expected Son of man, whom one day every eye shall see as both Judge and Saviour."[3]

---

[1] Francis Dewar, "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative in St. Mark," Theology, LXIV (1961), 99-107.

[2] Lightfoot, Gospel Message, p. 52. [3] Ibid., p. 54.

Thirdly, the parallels between 13:32, 33, 35, 36 and the scene in Gethsemane (14:32-42) are exceptionally vivid. In chapter 13 Jesus warns the disciples: "But of that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father. Take heed, watch; for you do not know when the time will come . . . Watch therefore . . . lest he come suddenly and find you asleep." At Gethsemane, the hour arrives when the Son of man is delivered up, and, in spite of Jesus' warnings to watch, they are found sleeping. Many of the words are exact parallels as Jesus tells his three disciples at Gethsemane, "Remain here and watch" (14:34); when he returns and finds them sleeping, he says, "Could you not watch one hour? Watch and pray that you may not enter into temptation . . ."; and when he finds them sleeping the third time, he asks them, "Are you still sleeping and taking your rest? It is enough; the hour has come; the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners" (14:41). In these literary parallels the interconnection between chapter 13 and the passion narrative are quite clear and precise, just as chapter 13 is also connected securely with the narrative preceding it. On this basis, it is easy to say, with Conzelmann, that the discourse about the last things in chapter 13 concludes the ministry of Jesus and forms a transition to the passion.[1]

The literary interconnections are obvious, but, secondly, to attain the Evangelist's view of this chapter in the overall narrative we must carefully distinguish tradition and redaction. We begin with chapter 13 itself. The source, form-critical, and tradition-historical analyses of this chapter, which have focused upon the extent of the discourse as the

---

[1] Conzelmann, "Mc 13," p. 211.

Evangelist found it and the degree to which he modified it as he placed it in his Gospel, can furnish the data by which the Evangelist's views emerge. These discussions[1] indicate that at least vss. 7-8, 14-20, 24-27 contain the pre-Marcan apocalyptic core.[2] Within these verses stands an account of the events of the end time which concludes with the coming of the Son of man with great power and glory. The Evangelist has broken up this sequence of events, however, and sandwiched in between the parts sayings concerning persecution, false Christs and false prophets, and exhortations to watch not to be led astray or to be found sleeping. The importance of the material introduced by the Evangelist has been pointed out by Conzelmann. Prior to Mark the kerygmatic statements about the death and resurrection never mention the parousia, and the parousia announcements never mention the death and resurrection.[3] The Marcan Evangelist did not directly connect them, but in chapter 13 he took a step in that direction by connecting "the Christological sentences about the past with those about the future."[4] This is achieved through discussion of the "coming" Son of man and, rather that the "delivered up, dying, and rising" Son of man, the disciples' being "delivered up" to councils for persecution. As he juxtaposes the disciples' situation in the present with the Son of man's coming in the future, the Evangelist is giving a Christological and eschatological interpretation of the disciples' present situation. At the same time, however, this interpretation is the means of concluding the ministry of Jesus and forming a transition to the passion narrative.[1]

---

[1] Aptly reported by G. R. Beasely-Murray, A Commentary on Mark Thirteen (London: Macmillan and Co., 1957), pp. 1-18.

[2] Taylor, Mark, p. 498; Marxsen, Markus, p. 108.

[3] Conzelmann, "Mc 13," p. 210. [4] Ibid., p. 211.

The selection and placement of this rewritten apocalypse just prior to the passion narrative in which the Son of man is "delivered up" (14:21; 14:41) and the Son of man will come "with the clouds of heaven" (14:62) focuses upon the past time when the Son of man was arrested and killed, and the future time when he will come as Son of man.[2] This focus becomes Christological when, in the intermittent verses in chapter 13, the Evangelist brings together the delivering up of the disciples with the command to watch for the coming Son of man. At this point, the coming Son of man is understood to be Jesus returning in full power, and the disciples' being delivered up is understood in the narrative to represent "following" the Son of man through discipleship to his death and resurrection.

The Son of Man-Son of God

In the passion narrative itself the Evangelist has inserted sayings which contain the titles Son of man and Son of God to bring into the story of Jesus' death the Christological meaning of Jesus which he envisions. The insertion of Christological materials brought in not only sayings but entire narratives. These narratives bring into correlation the titles Son of man and Son of God.

The insertions into the passion narrative by the Marcan Evangelist have been analyzed by various scholars. The investigation begins by determining the extent of the pre-Marcan passion narrative. As was mentioned above,[3] it has been suggested for many years that the passion narrative had a long existence in the Church before the Marcan Evangelist wrote his Gospel.[1] The basic agreement between the fourth Gospel and the Synoptics in this section of the narrative produces the probability that the sequence of the passion narrative had been established quite early and the greatest freedom asserted by the Evangelists was the addition of certain traditions into it.

---

[1] *Ibid.* [2] *Ibid.* [3] Above, p. 3.

The narrative agreed upon by most scholars extended from the arrest of Jesus (Mark 14:43) to his crucifixion. This scope for the earliest account of the passion events is supported by the traditional summaries or formulas found in the New Testament (I Cor. 15:3-5; Mark 9:31; 10:33-34).[2] The Marcan Evangelist has prefaced this scope of the narrative with the Anointing of Jesus at Bethany (14:3-9); the Last Supper (14:10-31); and Gethsemane (14:32-42). Further, his account of Jesus' Trial by the Sanhedrin, within the passion narrative, is a product of Christological reflection[3] which contributes directly to the Evangelist's Christological message. An analysis of the Christological reflection in the positioning of these narratives and in the application of sayings containing Christological titles makes available to us the Christological presentation envisioned by the Evangelist.

First of all, the Anointing of Jesus at Bethany (14:3-9) presents one more way in which the Marcan Evangelist has correlated Jesus' ministry with his death. Whereas an earlier version of this story in Luke 7:36-50 draws no connection between this anointment and Jesus' burial, the Marcan

---

[1] Dibelius, Tradition, pp. 178-217.

[2] Recently, Lohse, Suffering and Death, pp. 4-17.

[3] Ibid., pp. 84-87.

Evangelist has surrounded it on each side with references to Jesus' death. He has prefaced the account with two verses (14:1-2) in which he again sets the stage, after the transition in 13:1-37, for the passion events: the chief priests and the scribes try to seize him to destroy him but do not want to arouse the mob near the time of the feast of Unleavened Bread. The account of the anointing is oriented directly toward Jesus' death, then, in the two appended verses (14:8-9) in which Jesus interprets the anointing in terms of preparation for burial and indicates that her action should be included in all gospel proclamation.

Then the Evangelist has introduced Jesus' Passover feast with the disciples and the subsequent scene in Gethsemane. The Passover feast, which already contained the discussion of the betrayer who eats with him, is prefaced with Judas' agreement to betray Jesus (14:10-11) and is concluded with a Son of man saying in which the betrayer, though able to deliver Jesus up because it fulfills scripture, will meet a dreadful end himself because it is the Son of man whom he delivers up (14:21). In a similar manner the scene at Gethsemane, in which the disciples are commanded to remain awake and watch, is prefaced with the foretelling of Peter's denial (14:27-31) and concluded with a Son of man saying which indicates that the hour of the betrayal is at hand (14:41-42).

With these two episodes, the Evangelist has firmly connected the subsequent passion events with the title Son of man. The earliest accounts of the passion events did not contain this title, as is still evident from its absence in the passion episodes. By prefacing these

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

accounts with two episodes, each of which concludes with a saying concerning the "delivering up" of the Son of man, the Evangelist interpreted the passion episodes as events which the "Son of man" goes through.

But the Evangelist has not yet completed his Christological purpose. Jesus' passion must be integrated not only with the title Son of man, but also with the title Son of God. This is achieved through the accounts of the Trial before the Sanhedrin (14:53-65) and the Crucifixion of Jesus (15:21-41).

In the Trial before the Sanhedrin three Christological titles are brought together: Christ, Son of God, and Son of man. First of all, the juxtaposition of Christ and Son of God in the question by the high priest, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" (14:61), indicates reflection of the Christian community upon the Messiah Jesus. The Jewish community did not so correlate these titles in its messianic discussions primarily because it did not, at this stage, use titles in the focused way in which the Christian community did. Very likely, for the Evangelist, the title Son of the Blessed (using a circumlocution for the name of God) is the most important in this question. Throughout the Gospel, the title Christ lingers near (1:1; 8:29; 9:41; 12:35; 14:61; 15:32), but it stands as an assumed title within the narrative rather than a title redactionally inserted for a Christological purpose. Evidently, the Evangelist and his community, while they have inherited the title Christ, do not find this title to be decisively useful in the proclamation of the gospel. Thus, the Evangelist links this title with Son of God (1:1; 12:35[?]; 14:61) and Son of man (8:29; 14:61-62). In

14:61 Jesus, in the midst of the passion events, affirms that he is the Son of God. But, secondly, Jesus asserts the future coming of the Son of man (14:62). In this scene the suffering, dying, rising Son of man brings together by his own confession the conceptions of the future Son of man and the authoritative and dying Son of God.

This correlation is completed in the account of the Crucifixion where, after taunts that "the Christ, the king of Israel" should come down from the cross (15:32), Jesus, when he dies, is acclaimed to be Son of God by a Gentile Centurion (15:39). In this confession the authoritative Son of man-Son of God is linked together with the suffering and dying Son of man-Son of God. The Christological confession has come full circle and the Son of man and Son of God titles decisively inform the Christological presentation.

Conclusion

The preceding analysis of the Marcan narrative has indicated that the Evangelist collected narratives concerning Jesus around certain Christological titles. He placed a large number of stories depicting Jesus' power to heal around a summary directing this activity toward the title Son of God. Jesus' rejection as a prophet, and his acceptance of his rejection, death, and resurrection was caught up in the title Son of man. Likewise, the challenge of discipleship is most clearly connected with the title Son of man. The Evangelist has designated Jesus' activity in Jerusalem as primarily Son of David activity which depicts the status of those undertakings but offers little to his Christological function in the later community to which Mark is addressed.

The correlation of these titles with these functions of Jesus most likely affected the use of those titles in the early Church. By it, the Marcan Evangelist contributed to the affixing of certain titles with certain aspects of Jesus' activity. The history of the connection of these titles with certain functions of Jesus from the formation of the first Gospel to the Christological debates of the early Church Fathers would aid us in evaluating just how significant that first collection of narratives around certain titles really was. We can already suggest that this correlation was an important Christological contribution by the Marcan Evangelist to the productions by the Matthean and Lucan Evangelists. Primarily, these correlations represented beginning points from which these later Evangelists could independently develop their Christological views. Thus, the Matthean Evangelist, very interested in the title Son of David, could multiply that confession in healing contexts (Matt. 9:27; 15:22; 20:30-31), because the Marcan Evangelist had so introduced the title into the Jerusalem ministry of Jesus. Likewise, the Lucan Evangelist's reflection upon Mark led him to integrate the prophet-rejection motif into Jesus' Spirit-filled ministry in the opening scene of that ministry (Luke 4:16-30) and to draw many narratives together in a short scope of his narrative to highlight the title Son of God (Luke 1:32; 1:35; 3:22; 3:38; 4:3; 4:9; 4:41). Thus the production of the first Gospel not only made it possible to expand "the gospel" into a book for teaching (Matthew) or a history of the earliest Church (Luke), but it also brought into the Christian community a gospel proclamation which contained a sophisticated stage of Christological reflection.

CHAPTER III

THE CHRISTOLOGICAL UNITY OF MARK

The Correlation of Authority and Humiliation in Mark

In the previous part certain units of the narrative in which the image of Jesus is succinctly depicted were analyzed in detail. These, when viewed from the redactional activity in them and when correlated with the narratives in the intervening materials, furnish the key for understanding the Evangelist's use of titles and narratives within his presentation. In this part, now, the Christological unity which is envisioned in the Gospel, when the use of titles and narratives is viewed from these key redactional units, will be suggested.

First of all, the Evangelist, when he used a Christological title, used it both to display Jesus' authority and to display his humiliation. This is vividly revealed by his use of Son of man and Son of God in connection with both Jesus' authoritative ministry and his being killed. Yet this use of titles to bring the themes of Jesus' authority and his humiliation into a Christologically unified depiction is noticeable in his use of the other titles as well. When this is exhibited through a discussion of each title, the Christological unity of the narrative, as well as its composite character, can be discerned.

We will begin with the title Son of God, since the prominence of this title in the narrative has long been noticed. The title Son of God is connected with Jesus' authoritative status in the Baptism by the announcement of Jesus' divine sonship. In this scene the splitting of the heavens, the descent of the dove, and the fatherly voice from heaven indicate the beginning of eschatological time.[1] The activities by which salvation is to be actuated are beginning to take place. At this point the Spirit enters into him (1:10) and through this holy Spirit he is able to cast out the unclean spirits, the demons (3:22-30). This relation of divine sonship to Jesus' power to heal by casting out demons is given prominence in the transitional summary unit in 3:7-12. As Jesus heals, the unclean spirits cry out, "You are the Son of God." Accordingly, they recognize the power of this one into whom the Spirit entered at Baptism, and they have no power against him. This title had already come into at least one story of exorcism (5:1-20), and the Evangelist placed it as first in a sequence of three which he used to depict the highpoint of Jesus' healing ministry (5:1-43). We can suppose that this story was especially acceptable to the Evangelist for one of the three climactic episodes in his narrative, since in it Jesus is able to cast out not just one, but an entire legion of unclean spirits (5:9).

The authoritative status of the Son of God is reaffirmed for his eschatological function through the Transfiguration scene and the question of the high priest at the Trial before the Sanhedrin. In the Transfiguration episode, Jesus is proclaimed to the three disciples as the divine Son. This episode, like the Baptism, contains eschatological imagery which points to Jesus' function within the end time. Yet here, unlike the Baptism, Jesus is transformed into a heavenly figure--a worthy one who has been resurrected into heaven.[2] This heavenly status as Son of God is only to be made known after the Son of man rises from the dead (9:9). Jesus' acceptance into heaven, alongside Old Testament men of God like Elijah and Moses, is connected with his designation Son of God. In the Trial before the Sanhedrin the title Son of the Blessed stands in apposition to the title Messiah.[1] The title Messiah, in turn, connotes Jesus' authoritative status, as the passage demonstrates by its reference to the Son of man "sitting at the right hand of power" (Ps. 110:1) and "coming with the clouds of heaven" (Dan. 7:13). As is generally known, the dispute over this passage concerns the relation of the sitting at the right hand to the coming with the clouds. Glasson posited that the passage is to be interpreted completely in parallel to Dan. 7:13 where the Son of man goes on the clouds to heaven and is there installed to his position of power at the right hand of God.[2] Thus, according to Glasson, "it is exclusively the exaltation to the position of ruler at God's right hand which is to be demonstrated to the members of the Sanhedrin."[3] Against this, however, stands the word order in the quotation of Dan. 7:13 which corresponds to that used in Jewish interpretation for his return to earth, not his movement from earth to heaven to be exalted to his position of power.[4] Consequently, if the coming of the Son of man in Mark 14:62 refers to the parousia rather than the journey for receiving exaltation, the scene perhaps refers to two stages of action--the bestowal of power and the parousia. While Lohmeyer suggested this, Tödt denies it, arguing that these elements are best interpreted "not as two stages but as two factors equally related to the coming Son of man."[1] Without going into this further, we must notice that in each view the assertions concern Jesus' sovereign power, either at a time before the parousia or as an accompanying factor with the parousia. The striking part of the scene lies in the correlation of three Christological titles to display Jesus' sovereignty over those who are condemning him.[2] This is, of course, the first completely public confession of this sovereignty by Jesus, and the Son of God title is correlated with the titles Messiah and Son of man in this expression of his sovereign status.

---

[1] Vielhauer, "Erwägungen," p. 161. [2] _Ibid._, pp. 162-63.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 159-60.

[2] T. F. Glasson, The Second Advent (3d ed.; London: Epworth Press, 1963), pp. 64-66.

[3] Tödt's summary of Glasson's conclusions in Son of Man, p. 38.

[4] R. B. Y. Scott, "Behold He Cometh with Clouds," New Testament Studies, V (1959), 127-32; discussed in Norman Perrin, "Mark 14.62: End Product of a Christian Pesher Tradition?", New Testament Studies, XII (1966), 151-54.

Hence, the Marcan Evangelist connected the title Son of God with Jesus' authoritative status in the narrative. Even though Jesus is rejected and killed, his authoritative status assures his resurrection and his power over unclean spirits and men.

On the other hand, the Evangelist uses the title Son of God in connection with Jesus' humiliation--his rejection and death. In the parable of the Vineyard (12:1-12), the beloved Son, who is sent after many others have been either beaten or killed, is killed by the wicked overseers. Whether this parable was originally a parable or an allegory,[3] the Evangelist has applied it allegorically to Jesus' rejection and death by the leaders of Judaism. The quotation of Ps. 118:22-23 in it connects it with other uses of this passage to interpret Jesus' rejection and death.[1] The use of "beloved Son" and "my Son" indicates some relation to the accounts of the Baptism and Transfiguration,[2] but in this allegory the title is correlated with Jesus' rejection and death. This use of the title corresponds with the confession by the Centurion at the Crucifixion that "truly this man was [the] Son of God." At his painful death, Jesus is recognizable as the Son of God to the Gentile official standing by. Given the tremendous authority which is attached to this title in other places in the narrative, one would not expect the point of death to bring an acclamation with this same title. Yet the Evangelist has so applied the title, and in his application we begin to perceive the unity of authority and humiliation which he sees in Jesus and which has guided him in his use of the title Son of God.

---

[1] Tödt, Son of Man, p. 39. [2] Ibid., p. 37.

[3] C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, Fontana Books (Rev. ed.; London: James Nisbet, 1961), pp. 93-98 and Jeremias, Parables, pp. 70-77, argue that it was first a parable; W. G. Kümmel, "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärten (Mark 12.1-9)," Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne. Mélanges offerts à Maurice Goguel, Bibliothèque Theologique (Paris: Delacheux and Niestlé, 1950), pp. 120-31, that it was always an allegory.

Secondly, in our discussion of the titles in Mark, we analyze the Evangelist's use of the title Son of man. Early in the Church, sayings were found in which the Son of man, invested with all authority and power from God, would judge people on the basis of their response to Jesus' ministry (e.g. Luke 12:8-9). In the reflection of the believers, Jesus came to be identified with the Son of man, and they awaited the day when he would come to earth invested with full power and authority to judge (e.g. Luke 17:29-30). The Marcan Evangelist applies the title Son of man also to a heavenly figure who will come with such power (8:38; 13:26; 14:62), and for the Evangelist there is no question but that the Son of man will be Jesus returning in full heavenly status (this is especially clear in 8:38: "when he comes in the glory of his father"). But also, the Evangelist has applied the title Son of man to depict Jesus' authoritative ministry. The authority in these episodes, however, is not the transcendent kind of power and authority which the returning Son of man will possess, but reflects the specific authoritative nature of Jesus' claims concerning God's activity.[1] In this dimension, the Son of man claims the authority to forgive sins (2:10) and to abrogate the sabbath (2:28). This authority corresponds to Jesus' authority as Son of God to cast out demons. For this reason, while the Evangelist typifies Jesus' status in his healing ministry by the title Son of God (3:11), he included two episodes in which these activities are connected with the title Son of man (2:1-12; 2:23-28).

---

[1] Lindars, _Apologetic_, pp. 169-74. [2] Hahn, _Titles_, p. 304.

Consequently, the Marcan Evangelist applied the title Son of man to Jesus' authority both in connection with his return in the future in transcendent sovereignty and his authoritative ministry on earth. In each instance it is the dimension of power and authority found within that realm of activity to which the Son of man is applied. Thus the title itself does not always carry with it the same connotations, but rather is applied to those two distinct powerful activities of Jesus.

Divergently, the Evangelist also applied the title Son of man to Jesus' humiliation at the hands of men. The application of the title solely in connection with humiliation occurs only in 9:12: scriptural fulfillment indicates that the Son of man is to suffer many things and be treated with contempt. In this instance the Son of man title is found with a concept seemingly completely discordant with the use of it in authoritative contexts. Yet, for the Evangelist, these two concepts are held together in unity. In 14:21 and 14:41 the Evangelist uses two Son of man sayings which, though containing humiliation, also contain a dimension of authority similar to that found in the Son of man sayings referring to Jesus' earthly activity. In 14:21 the Son of man is delivered up by "that man." But, even as he is delivered up, the Son of man pronounces a threat against the man who delivers him up, and, further, he goes in the way of the passion according to the scriptures. In this we see not only the scriptural fulfillment which characterizes the activity against the Son of man, but the Son of man himself has foreknowledge of the event and asserts the power to pronounce the fate of his betrayer. Hence, this passage holds together the humiliation of the Son of man with his fulfillment of scripture and his authoritative status over that man who betrays him. Similarly, 14:41 captures the humiliation in the phrase "delivered into the hands of sinners," yet this happens because the "hour" has come. As Kuhn has shown,[1] the Evangelist has here fused together a legendary account of the Gethsemane episode with an account which was designed to give a "Christological pronouncement about the hour of the Son of man."[2] The "hour" is not to be understood as an apocalyptic time sequence, but is here correlated with Jesus' knowledge of the plan and will of God.[3] Accordingly, the Son of man in his hour of humiliation nevertheless stands authoritatively within God's will. The Christological paradox thus arises that the authoritative Son of man encounters complete humiliation, yet for the Evangelist these two concepts form a Christologically unified concept of Jesus' activities.

---

[1] Tödt, Son of Man, pp. 117, 230, 295-96, passim.

---

[1] Kuhn, "Gethsemane," pp. 260-85. [2] Ibid., p. 274.

[3] Tödt, Son of Man, p. 186.

In yet another use of the Son of man title, the Evangelist unified the authority of Jesus and his humiliation. In these, the humiliation is even more vividly displayed and at the same time the authoritative status of Jesus is captured in a poignant image--the resurrection. We mentioned above that in 9:12 the Son of man title is connected directly with the suffering and rejection. We must now notice that the Evangelist did not leave this pronouncement standing alone, but has juxtaposed it with a saying in which the Son of man title is linked directly with the resurrection (9:9). Thus we see that the Evangelist also unifies the concepts of authority and humiliation through the images of the passion events and the resurrection. This he has systematically achieved in his regularly spaced passion predictions (8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34). In the first instance the suffering and rejection by the Jewish leaders is correlated with the Son of man's rising up after three days. And here we must notice that the Son of man is not to "be raised" (egerthēnai) by God, but will himself "rise up" (anastēnai). This assertion of the Son of man's own ability to rise up is found in all of these Son of man sayings in which the resurrection is mentioned. While 8:31 juxtaposes the suffering and rejection with his promise to rise up after three days, 9:31 and 10:33-34 correlate his "being delivered up" with this rising up after three days. While in 9:31 he is simply delivered "into the hands of men," in 10:33-34 he is delivered twice--first to the Jewish leaders, then to the Gentiles. In this last passage the episodes of the humiliation of the Son of man by the Gentiles are specifically cited and then the pronouncement of his rising up occurs. In these we see again the correlation of Jesus' authority and his humiliation.

Yet the complete fusion of humiliation into the authority has not been achieved, not in these Son of man sayings prior to Mark, nor yet in these passion-resurrection sayings. This was to be attained only in one passage--Mark 10:45. In this passage we see the complete fusion of humiliation and authority which guided the Evangelist. The conceptual framework is quite different so that the Christological fusion of humiliation and authority occurs. In all the other sayings in the Gospel, the Son of man's authority sets the context. Either the Son of man asserts his authority without any real concern over his adversaries (both the future Son of man and the Son of man in his earthly activity), or the Son of man's authority will be asserted in spite of his rejection (passion-resurrection sayings). In 10:45 the Son of man's achievement lies in his humiliation, not in his ability to overcome or stand above his humiliation. He comes to serve and in serving he brings salvation. Thus, in this saying alone the Evangelist has completely achieved the fusion of authority and humiliation of the Son of man into a Christological unity. In it alone the Christological authority lies in the humiliation.

In the Evangelist's use of the title prophet we again see the correlation of authority and humiliation. The concept of prophet in the first century A.D. could carry with it the concept of authority. For, if a true prophet arose during this time, it would mean that the beginning of the eschatological time had dawned, and God was again actively encountering his elect through his human spokesman. Such a prophet would be an eschatological prophet, an end time prophet, who would prepare the people to face God or one of his emissaries who would bring in the New Age. At this time, the prophecy which had ceased in Israel after the Exile would be renewed by God. The Marcan Evangelist retained this application of the title prophet to John the Baptist in 11:32 and applied it to the people's estimation of the role of Jesus in 6:15 and 8:28. This title carries with it the authority which the one has who announces God's will--thus it corresponds well with Jesus' announcement of God's rule in his ministry. But the Evangelist also applies this title to Jesus at the point of his rejection. Thus, at the climax of his authoritative healing ministry, the Evangelist characterized Jesus as the rejected prophet (6:4). For him the correlation of authority and humiliation is primary, and the title prophet is applied to each concept in his narrative.

Moreover, in his application of the title Son of David, the Evangelist correlated the concepts of humiliation and authority in Jesus. In 10:46-52 the Evangelist has connected the Son of David title with the authoritative healing ministry which Jesus has performed. When the blind Bartimaeus cries out to Jesus the Son of David, Jesus heals him without even touching him and the former blind man "follows in the way." In this manner the Son of David title is connected with Jesus' ministry, which contains both authoritative healings and calls to follow in discipleship. This authority as Son of David is linked with his Jerusalem activities through the cries put on the lips of the people as Jesus enters that city: "Blessed is the kingdom of our father David that is coming" (11:10). As has been noticed, "a statement of this kind is markedly unJewish."[1] Evidently, then, through Christian interpretation of Ps. 118:26, to which the cry is related, the coming Davidic kingdom has been linked with Jesus and the clause is understood as "an indirect allusion to His [Jesus'] Davidic sonship."[2] Hence, the Triumphal Entry scene is understood by the Evangelist to depict the entrance of the Son of David into the city of his humiliation. As noticed above, the Son of David's activities in Jerusalem are characterized by great authority. Yet the attempts of the Jewish leaders to destroy him (11:18; 12:12) and to question his authority and teaching (11:27-28; 12:13; 12:28), and Jesus' denunciation of the scribes (12:38-40) characterize Jerusalem as the place of his humiliation. Thus, when the Evangelist inserted Jesus' discussion of the Son of David title in response to the way in which the scribes interpret it (12:35-37), it is not surprising that the title Son of David is left, so to speak, hanging in the air. As has already been indicated, it does not seem proper to say that the Evangelist rejects the title--he used it positively to characterize Jesus' authority as he entered Jerusalem. Yet, Jesus is to be rejected by those very Jewish teachers who say that the Messiah is the Son of David. Thus, again the paradoxical correlation of authority and humiliation guides the Evangelist's use of the title in his Gospel, and the authoritative one who is rejected sets a new stage for belief and salvation.

Not only in his application of titles, but also in his redaction of narratives, the Evangelist has been guided by the Christological correlation of authority and humiliation. To a great extent he has connected the authoritative status of Jesus with the narratives of humiliation by the use of the titles Son of God and Son of man in the passages already discussed. The juxtaposition of the three titles in the Trial before the Sanhedrin, and the Son of man sayings in the Last Supper and Gethsemane stories, served to bring into humiliation narratives the motif of Jesus' authoritative status.

---

[1] Hahn, Titles, p. 255. [2] Ibid., p. 256.

A most significant part of the Evangelist's task, however, lay in introducing the theme of rejection and humiliation into narratives which depicted Jesus acting with great authority. This we have already noticed in the interjections in the narratives in Jerusalem that the Jewish leaders constantly question him, disagree with him, and even try to kill him. When treated as individual units, these episodes are viewed as controversy stories. Yet, in the Gospel narrative the Evangelist has capitalized on this theme in the earlier traditions to bring together the concept of authority and the concept of humiliation in Jesus' activities.

In the healing ministry the Evangelist works out this correlation both by bringing rejection into scenes of authority and authority into scenes of rejection. On the one hand, when his healing of a paralytic is rejected as blasphemy, this is countered not only by Jesus' pronouncement that, in addition, his sins are forgiven, but also by a statment of the Son of man's authority (2:1-12). Likewise, when Jesus and his disciples are criticized for their activities on the sabbath, in addition to the argument concerning David and the showbread, the authority of the Son of man over the sabbath is asserted (2:23-28). Thus, where the narrative has depicted the rejection of Jesus, the Evangelist has strengthened Jesus' authoritative status. On the other hand, when the narrative primarily depicts Jesus' authoritative status, the Evangelist has introduced rejection into it. The most well-known example is the Evangelist's comment in 3:6 that, in the midst of an authoritative ministry, when Jesus healed a man with a withered hand the Pharisees and Herodians counselled together to destroy him. In addition, we have investigated in detail the way in which the Evangelist introduced the theme of rejection directly into a scene of authoritative synagogue ministry in 6:1-6. Moreover, the disciples' misunderstanding of his activities (6:37; 6:52; 8:4; 8:16-21) brings into Jesus' ministry rejection from his own disciples. When Jesus has the power to feed thousands of people from small portions of food and calm the sea, the disciples misunderstand and mistrust. Hence, both humiliation and authority characterize Jesus' relationship to his closest followers.

This subordination of narratives to the Christological unification of authority and humiliation in Jesus is most completely achieved in 8:27-10:45. There, as has been noticed, the entire juxtaposition of sayings and narratives involves the affirmation that Jesus will be rejected and killed, and when the disciples hear this from Jesus' lips, they in turn reject this teaching and systematically misunderstand what he tries to teach them (8:32-33; 9:32-34, 38-40; 10:13; 10:35-40). Conversely, into these scenes come assertions of Jesus' authoritative power. Not only will he himself rise up (8:31; 9:9; 9:31; 10:34), but he can heal a boy whom the disciples cannot (9:14-29), and even a voice from heaven announces to the three disciples that they must listen to this authoritative teacher (9:7).

Hence, the Evangelist has been guided in his use of titles and narratives by the insight that Jesus is to be understood throughout the Gospel as authoritative and rejected. Jesus has tremendous authority, yet he is constantly humiliated--if not by Jewish leaders, then by his family or even his own disciples. And in this lies his greatness; the disciples are to identify with him precisely at the point where the rejection and authority intersect for salvation--the passion and resurrection.

Our central investigation has led to the suggestion that the use of titles and narratives to correlate authority and humiliation in the life of Jesus reveals itself with exceptional clarity in the structure of the Marcan narrative. It has been necessary to mention a couple of these units already in this chapter, but they must be approached once again to summarize the evidence which arises from them. The transitional units, which occur in the narrative where the story line is redirected or summarized, furnish a particularly clear picture of the Christological correlation of authority and humiliation which the Evangelist perceives in Jesus Christ. In 1:14-15 Jesus' authority, at the beginning of his ministry, is asserted in that he preaches the gospel of God and performs his ministry when the time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand. Yet, in this same unit his ministry is linked with the Baptist's ministry through the image of the fate which characterizes the end of the Baptist's ministry. As we have seen, the Evangelist built upon this point of comparing Jesus and the Baptist, by using the Baptist's ministry as a contrapuntal theme in the Gospel which intertwined his ministry and Jesus' in rejection and death (6:14-29;

9:12-13). With 3:7-12, the Evangelist, immediately after portraying the meeting of the Pharisees and Herodians to plot Jesus' death (3:6), vividly portrays Jesus' successful ministry through a scene where people come from all over Palestine to touch him and be healed by him, and Jesus is hailed as the Son of God by the defeated unclean spirits. At 6:1-6, the authoritative ministry of Jesus in the synagogues, which furnishes the framework for the episode, is so openly rejected that Jesus himself is characterized as the rejected prophet who can perform no mighty healings in that situation. In this unit the amazing power of Jesus, just climaxed by three exceptional healings (5:1-43), is correlated with the fateful death at the end of Jesus' ministry, interjected by the vivid account of the Baptist's death (6:14-29). In 8:27-33, the misunderstandings which are possible in the attempts to correlate Jesus' authority with his humiliation, are given proper status in the image of the Son of man, who is not only one who is rejected and killed, but who has the power to rise from the dead. In this manner the Son of man's authority and his rejection are given their proper emphasis for perceiving the status and function of Jesus Christ. With 10:46-52 the concept of authority through humiliation which has been attained in 10:45 is correlated with Jesus' authoritative healing ministry, and Jesus' powerful criticism of the Jewish nation and its leaders is correlated with the rejection by those leaders that brings his death outside of their city. In this way the title Son of David is connected with the power to heal the blind Bartimaeus and cleanse the Temple, yet it also is connected with the rejection and death of Jesus at the hands of the Jewish officials of the Temple. In 13:1-37, the authority and humiliation of Jesus are integrated into the responsibility of discipleship in the Evangelist's own time. Thus, the disciple, when he is delivered up (13:9, 11, 12), should not be overwhelmed by the humiliation which he encounters (13:9) nor be led astray by those who pretend to have power and authority (13:4-5, 21-22), but he must follow in belief, led by the one in whom is both authority and humiliation, until the Son of man comes with great power and glory (13:26).

Consequently, authority and humiliation are so correlated in the Gospel that a unified picture of Jesus is effected. Furthermore, this combination challenges the disciple to follow in that some way. The believer, then, confronts his faith Christologically--his belief holds the image of the community's reflection upon Jesus' life and death which structures his own participation in life and death. This belief holds together the power and humiliation which he himself encounters.

Marcan Christology and Rome

Last of all, we suggest that if Mark was written under the circumstances which some have suggested, and which S. G. F. Brandon has recently reinforced, then the place of origin supports the manner in which the Evangelist correlated authority and humiliation in his depiction of Jesus. S. G. F. Brandon has suggested, most clearly in his book *Jesus and the Zealots*,[1] that many of the characteristic features and allusions in Mark are best explained by interpreting them from that situation in which Roman Christians would have found themselves shortly after 71 A.D. During the year 70 A.D., of course, Vespasian's army destroyed the Jewish Temple and destroyed most of Jerusalem. In 71 A.D., then, this army returned to Rome and celebrated its victories through an elaborate parade through the streets of Rome. Along with other spoils from the victories, many articles from the Jerusalem Temple were displayed. These articles included the table of showbread, the golden lampstand, the purple curtains of the Temple, a copy of the Torah, and many vessels.[1] Also, they built large moving stages (so high that many feared that they would fall over) on which episodes of the victorious sieges were depicted.[2] Thus to all the inhabitants of Rome the destruction of the rebellious Jewish nation and its Temple was re-enacted in pictures and the spoils of victory were openly displayed.

---

[1] *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967).

It was at this time that the relationship of the Christian community to the Jewish population in Judea would have been of prime importance for maintaining a Christian community with close proximity to the center of Roman rule. The Christians in Rome in 71 A.D. faced a severe problem. If Jesus is to be understood primarily as a proponent of Judean Judaism, then Christian believers are easily associated with the insurrectionist Judean Jews who have just been defeated by Roman troops.[3] This would be especially acute for the Christian believer, since Jesus was executed under orders of a Roman official in the manner in which such a man deals with an insurrectionist, i.e. by having him crucified.

---

[1] Josephus War 7. 148-52, 162; 6. 387-91; see ibid., pp. 228-29.

[2] Josephus War 7. 139-47.

[3] Tacitus Annales 15. 44, indicates that Romans associated Christianity with its Jewish origins, and for this reason they were suspicious of it.

The Marcan Evangelist must be careful, then, to distinguish Christianity from Judean Judaism and to remove all suspicion that Jesus was crucified on account of actually being guilty of insurrection. M. Goguel, early in this century, had already noticed the tendency within Mark to remove the responsibility for the crucifixion from Pilate to the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem.[1] Since Goguel's work, T. A. Burkill and P. Winter have expanded this insight with detailed analysis of the Marcan narrative.[2] With these more extensive analyses, it has become apparent that the Marcan Evangelist has depicted Jesus' relationship to his family, his disciples, and the Jewish leaders in such a way that Jesus, in the end, is cut off not only from Judean Judaism, but the earliest disciples who proclaim the message of Jerusalem Christianity. Moreover, Pilate realized Jesus' innocence but was forced by the Jewish leaders to execute him.

We are not, however, to think that this impetus has led to the Christological unity which we find in the Marcan Gospel. The Roman Christian, as he adheres to his belief, is himself vulnerable to persecutions by the Roman government. Thus, the story of Jesus intersects with his own life at the point of Jesus' rejection, humiliation, and death. Yet, he has hope (which has undoubtedly been further aroused by the Jewish Wars) for the return of the Son of man. His hope, however, is futile if he has no basis for thinking that Jesus has the ability, the power, and the support of God to return in full authority to judge all people. He finds the undergirding of this hope in the authoritative ministry of Jesus, and it is the fusion of these authoritative activities with the story of his death that brings forth the first Gospel. The Evangelist has not been content with an apology; he has been led to a proclamation that Jesus is the means of salvation in the Gentile Roman world.

---

[1] _Jesus and the Origins of Christianity_, Vol. I: _Prolegomena to the Life of Jesus_, trans. by Olive Wyon, Harper Torchbacks (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 464-65.

[2] T. A. Burkill, "The Competence of the Sanhedrin," _Vigiliae Christianae_, X (1956), 80-96; "The Trial of Jesus," _Vigiliae Christianae_, XII (1958), 1-18; "St. Mark's Philosophy of the Passion," _Novum Testamentum_, II (1958), 245-71; "Anti-Semitism in St. Mark's Gospel," _Novum Testamentum_, III (1959), 34-53; _Mysterious_, _passim_. Paul Winter, _On the Trial of Jesus_, Studia Judaica, Bd. 1 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1961).

But how has the Evangelist been led to the healing ministry of Jesus to support Jesus' primary place for salvation? At this point we suggest that the Evangelist has encountered in his association with people in the Roman world, believers whose faith is centered within a god in which authority and humiliation are an indelible part of his saving function. The story which they tell is a well-known story, and the places in which he is worshipped are abundant. The resemblance of their story to the structure of the Marcan narrative is so noticeable that the Marcan Evangelist surely structured his narrative with that Graeco-Roman story in the back of his mind.

The story is that of the divine healer Asclepius. This man, because he was the son of a god, possessed the skills not only to heal the sick (which many healers did) but to raise the dead. When, however, he raised Theseus' son from death to life, the gods feared that their honor was being jeopardized. When they complained to Zeus, he killed Asclepius with a thunderbolt. After that time the god was thought to have returned, because he was present in the temples dedicated to him. Through sonship to the god, Asclepiads could obtain the skills needed for healing. Many of these people, naturally, would not be true descendants in a family of physicians, yet the relationship of the skilled physician to his pupil was described in terms of sonship, and in that relationship he received the skills of the god Asclepius.[1]

Asclepius is first heard about in the Homeric tales of the Iliad.[2] There he is recognized as an exceptionally skilled physician. By 500 B.C.[3] all healers are designated as Asclepiads, i.e. sons of Asclepius. The cult of healing came to Athens in 421 B.C.[4] and to Rome in 295-293 B.C.,[5] and by the first century was widely distributed throughout the Hellenistic and Roman world.[6] The widespread familiarity with this story of Asclepius by writers, from 300 B.C. on, suggest that this story was a well-known myth explaining the life, death, and present function of the divine Asclepius in the healing cult.

This phenomenon is of particular importance to us for several reasons. First of all, Asclepius was the only healer whose activities were summed up as early as the fourth century B.C. in the statement that "he healed the sick and raised the dead."[1] This way of referring to Asclepius, because he had received powers which no other healer possessed, became the accepted way of referring to him in the literature of the first century A.D. and later.[2] These and references to his ability to heal all types of diseases are strikingly close to the Marcan summaries of Jesus' healing activities (e.g. 1:32-34). Also, the parallels between the healing of the paralytic boy and accounts of Asclepius' activities are noticeable.[3] Secondly, the accounts of Asclepius all acclaim that his ministry ended in death.[4] And, moreover, his death was connected with his power to raise from the dead. This is of special importance since, as R. H. Lightfoot had noticed,[5] in Mark Jesus is indicated clearly to be the rejected one immediately after he raised a person from death to life. Thirdly, the myth includes either his ascension or the certainty that he has returned to dwell in his temples.

---

[1] Edelstein, Asclepius, II, 57-58.

[2] Homer Iliad 2. 729-33; 4. 201-02, 218-19; 11. 504-20, 596-615; 14. 1-8; see Edelstein, Asclepius, I, 17, 32, 65, 80-83.

[3] Theognis Elegiae 432-34; see ibid., pp. 34, 112.

[4] Edelstein, Asclepius, II, 66; an Athenian inscription furnishes the date.

[5] Ibid., pp. 252-53; based on Ovid and inscriptions.

[6] Ibid., p. 133.

The cult of Asclepius commanded a large following amongst the ordinary population of the Graeco-Roman world. This was so representative that some scholars have felt that this cult, medicinal and physical in its appeal, was not acclaimed by the elite. Yet, quite a number of well-known philosophers, from Socrates to Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, spoke reverently of Asclepius or were fervent adherents of his cult,[1] and it is now evident from the numerous inscriptions in the temples that the wealthy as well as the poor frequented his temples. His festivals continued to be celebrated when those of other deities began to be forgotten,[2] and when Christianity became a state religion, Eusebius still complained that Asclepius led many a man away from the true Savior into his own "fraudulent cult."[3]

---

[1] Xenophon *Cynegeticus* 1. 6 (*anistanai men tethneōtas*, *nosountas de iasthai*); see Edelstein, *Asclepius*, I, 34, 112.

[2] [Apollodorus] *Bibliotheca* III, 10. 3. 8-9 (*ibid*., p. 8); Pausanias *Descriptio Graeciae* II, 26. 3-5 (*ibid*., pp. 13-14); Justin Martyr *Dialogue* 69. 3 (*ibid*., p. 49).

[3] The ability to heal someone when he had withered--become stiff, *xērainetai* (9:18); the cry "help me" (*boēthei*).

[4] See Edelstein, *Asclepius*, II, 46-49.

[5] At Mark 6:1-6; Lightfoot, *History*, p. 191.

If Mark was written in Rome, it is instructive that Justin Martyr chose his arguments carefully to attempt to distinguish between Christ and Asclepius. As a matter of fact, he admits that in many ways Christ and Asclepius are similar--so much so that they certainly should not consider Christ inferior to any of their gods.[4] In his debate with Trypho, he argued that, since Asclepius and Christ both performed the same kind of healings and raising of the dead, it is only natural to suggest that Asclepius had imitated the prophecies about Christ.[5] It is certain, then, that the similarity between Christ and Asclepius was being noticed in the middle of the second century in Rome, and it is further suggested here that the Christian Church in Rome, possessing miracle stories, had come into contact with Asclepius cults already in the latter half of the first century. Through this encounter, then, and the particular stress of being a Christian in Rome during these times, the Marcan Gospel, with its developed emphasis on the healing activity of Jesus, was produced.

---

[1] Edelstein, Asclepius, II, 116-19. [2] Ibid., p. 116.

[3] Ibid., p. 134; I, 419-20. [4] Apology 22. 6; 21. 1-2.

[5] Dialogue 69. 3.

Indeed, this is not the first occasion that someone has suggested that the Marcan Gospel was probably influenced by the cult of Asclepius. S. Angus, in 1929, noticed that there is a lack of consistency between Jesus' relentless rebuttal of those who requested signs from him and the stress on the miraculous works in the Gospels. This, he suggested, indicates that the Evangelists used these mighty works as "buttresses of Messianic faith,"[1] and, indeed, he suggests that "even as early as the composition of Mark (circ. 70) exorcism had such an apologetic value that Mark, writing for the Roman Church, unduly magnifies exorcism in the ministry of Jesus and advances it even as evidential for Jesus' Messiahship, to which the demons are forced to give testimony."[2]

This discussion of the cult of Asclepius has been presented here as one more support for the suggestion that the Marcan Evangelist sees at the center of his religious faith a Christ who lived to save and died to save, and the living and the dying are both an indelible part of the saving activity. For the Marcan Evangelist, Christ (even as Asclepius) raised a dead person (5:35-43) and so brought upon himself the rejection which led him to his death (6:1-6, 14-29).

But there is yet one more part to this understanding of the Marcan Gospel. The theme of sonship is strong in the cult of Asclepius: Asclepius is able not only to heal the sick but to raise the dead because he is the son of a god; likewise, those who heal are sons of Asclepius, Asclepiads. Are then the disciples of Jesus supposed to be sons of Jesus who heal in the Church? The disciples are sent out to heal in Mark (6:7-13), but they encounter sick people whom they are not able to heal (9:14-29). Thus, perhaps they do become involved in healing in the Church. Yet, the real context for understanding discipleship comes in sections concerning Jesus as the Son of man (8:27-10:45; 13:1-37). This leads us to a hypothesis regarding the use of the titles Son of man and Son of God in the Marcan Church. Jesus, the one who heals and dies, is the Son of God. Through this title Jesus is proclaimed to the Gentile community, and encounter with healing cults has fortified the use of Son of God in reference to Jesus' healing (3:11; 5:7) and his death (15:39). But Jesus, as the Son of God, has authority unlike anyone else. Those who attempt to imitate this authority are false Christs and false prophets (13:21-22). The center of discipleship lies in expectation, the expectation that he who was so powerful and died so ingloriously, will return in full power and glory. Yet, the challenge of discipleship is urgent, and even in the face of death the gospel must be preached to all nations (13:10).

---

[1] _The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World: A Study of the Historical Background of Early Christianity_ (Repr. ed.; New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1967), p. 418.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 436.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Angus, S. The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World: A Study of the Historical Background of Early Christianity. Repr. ed. New York: Biblo and Tannen, 1967.

Bacon, B. W. The Beginnings of Gospel Story. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1909.

Bacon, B. W. "The Markan Theory of Demonic Recognition of the Christ." Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, VI (1905), 153-58.

Bacon, B. W. "The Prologue of Mark: A Study of Sources and Structure." Journal of Biblical Literature, XXVI (1907), 84-106.

Baur, F. C. Das Markusevangelium. Tübingen: Ludw. Friedr. Fues., 1851.

Beasely-Murray, G. R. A Commentary on Mark Thirteen. London: Macmillan and Co., 1957.

Best, Ernest. The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, No. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament. Translated by Robert W. Funk. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Bornkamm, Günther; Barth, Gerhard; and Held, Heinz J. Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Translated by Percy Scott. The New Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

Brandon, S. G. F. Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. Naperville: Allenson, 1957.

Brandon, S. G. F. Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Jesus and the Word*. Translated by Louise P. Smith and Erminie H. Lantero. Fontana Books. London: Charles Scribner's Sond, 1958.

________. *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting*. Translated by R. H. Fuller. Meridian Books. 9th ed. New York: World Publishing Co., 1964.

________. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Burkill, T. A. "Anti-Semitism in St. Mark's Gospel." *Novum Testamentum*, III (1959), 34-53.

________. "The Competence of the Sanhedrin." *Vigiliae Christianae*, X (1956), 80-96.

________. "Concerning 5 7 and 5 18-20." *Studia Theologia*, XI (1957), 159-66.

________. "The Hidden Son of Man in St. Mark's Gospel." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LII (1961), 189-213.

________. "Mark 6:31-8:26: The Context of the Story of the Syrophoenician Woman." *The Classical Tradition*. *Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*. Edited by Luitpold Wallach. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1966. Pp. 329-44.

________. *Mysterious Revelation: An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1963.

________. "St. Mark's Philosophy of the Passion." *Novum Testamentum*, II (1958), 245-71.

________. "The Trial of Jesus." *Vigiliae Christianae*, XII (1958), 1-18.

Busch, Friedrich. *Zum Verständnis der Synoptischen Eschatologie: Markus 13 Neu Untersucht*. Neutestamentliche Forschungen, Heft 2. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1938.

Cave, C. H. "The Obedience of Unclean Spirits." *New Testament Studies*, XI (1964-65), 93-97.

Clarke, W. K. L. *New Testament Problems*. London: S. P. C. K., 1929.

Conzelmann, Hans. "Geschichte und Eschaton nach Mc 13." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, L (1959), 210-21.

Conzelmann, Hans. "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity." *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.

________. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. The New Testament Library. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Deissmann, Adolf. *Light from the Ancient East*. Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927.

Dewar, Francis. "Chapter 13 and the Passion Narrative in St. Mark." *Theology*, LXIV (1961), 99-107.

Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram L. Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.

Dinkler, Erich. "Petrusbekenntnis und Satanswort. Das Problem der Messianität Jesu." *Zeit und Geschichte*. *Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964. Pp. 127-53.

Dodd, Charles H. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. Fontana Books. Rev. ed. London: James Nisbet, 1961.

Edelstein, Emma J., and Edelstein, Ludwig. *Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*. 2 vols. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1945.

Fuller, Reginald H. *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Glasson, T. Francis. *The Second Advent*. 3d ed. London: Epworth, 1963.

Goguel, Maurice. *Jesus and the Origins of Christianity*. Vol. I: *Prolegomena to the Life of Jesus*. Translated by Olive Wyon. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

________. *L'Evangile de Marc*. Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des hautes études. Sciences religieuses, Vol. XXII. Paris: E. Leroux, 1909.

Grundmann, W. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, Bd. 2. 3d ed. Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1968.

Haenchen, Ernst. "Die Komposition von Mk. 8.27-9.1 und Par." *Novum Testamentum*, VI (1963), 81-109.

Hahn, Ferdinand. *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*. Translated by Harold Knight and George Ogg. London: Lutterworth Press, 1969.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Das Markusevangelium, nach seiner Composition, seiner Stellung in der Evangelien-Literatur, seinem Ursprung und Charakter*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1850.

Holtzmann, H. J. *Die Synoptiker*. Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, Bd. I. 1. 3d ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1901.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translated by Norman Perrin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.

________. *The Parables of Jesus*. Translated by S. H. Hooke. Rev. ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963.

Kähler, Martin. *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic, Biblical Christ*. Translated and edited by Carl E. Braaten. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

Käsemann, Ernst. "The Problem of the Historical Jesus." *Essays on New Testament Themes*. Translated by W. J. Montague. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 41. 2d ed. London: S. C. M. Press, 1965. Pp. 15-47.

Keck, Leander E. "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel." *New Testament Studies*, XII (1966), 352-70.

________. "Mark 3.7-12 and Mark's Christology." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXIV (1965), 341-58.

Klostermann, August. *Das Markus-Evangelium*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1867.

Klostermann, Erich. *Das Markusevangelium*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Bd. 1. 1st and 4th eds. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1907, 1950.

Knigge, Heinz-Dieter. "The Meaning of Mark. The Exegesis of the Second Gospel." *Interpretation*, XXII (1968), 53-70.

Kramer, Werner. *Christ, Lord, Son of God*. Translated by Brian Hardy. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 50. London: S. C. M. Press, 1966.

Kuby, A. "Zur Konzeption des Markusevangeliums." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLIX (1958), 52-64.

Kuhn, K. G. "Jesus in Gethsemane." *Evangelische Theologie*, XII (1952-53), 260-85.

Kümmel, W. G. "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtern (Mark 12.1-9)." *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne. Mélanges offerts à Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire.* Bibliothèque Théologique. Paris: Delacheux and Niestlé, 1950. Pp. 120-31.

Lightfoot, R. H. *The Gospel Message of St. Mark.* Oxford Paperbacks, No. 41. Oxford: University Press, 1950.

________. *History and Interpretation in the Gospels.* The Bampton Lectures. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934.

________. *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937.

Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.

Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Das Evangelium des Markus.* Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, Bd. 2. 17th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1967.

________. *Galiläa und Jerusalem.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Heft 34 [New Series]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1936.

Lohse, Eduard. *History of the Suffering and Death of Jesus Christ.* Translated by Martin O. Dietrich. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.

________. *Martyrer und Gottesknecht: Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom sühntod Jesu Christi.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Heft 64 [New Series, 46]. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1955.

Luz, Ulrich. "Das Geheimnismotiv und die markinische Christologie." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,* LVI (1965), 9-30.

Maddox, Robert. "The Function of the Son of Man According to the Synoptic Gospels." *New Testament Studies,* XV (1968), 45-74.

Martitz, Wülfing von; Fohrer, Georg; Lohse, Eduard; and Schweizer, Eduard. "*Huios.*" *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.* Bd. VIII. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1968, 334-84.

Marxsen, Willi. *Anfangsprobleme der Christologie.* 5th ed. Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher, 1967.

Marxsen, Willi. *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Heft 49 [New Series], Heft 67 [Entire Set]. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

________. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by G. Buswell. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

Michaelis, W. "*Paschō*." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. V. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967, 904-24.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. Translated by G. W. Anderson. New York: Abingdon Press, 1954.

Norden, Eduard. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913.

Perrin, Norman. "The Creative Use of the Son of Man Traditions by Mark," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, XXIII (1968), 357-65.

________. "Mark 14.62: End Product of a Christian Pesher Tradition?", *New Testament Studies*, XII (1965-66), 150-55.

Preuschen, E. "Das Wort zum verachten Propheten." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XVII (1916), 33-48.

Robinson, James M. *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Markusevangeliums*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Bd. 49 [New Series]. 2d ed. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959.

________. *The Problem of History in Mark*. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 21. 2d ed. London: S. C. M. Press, 1962.

________. "The Problem of History in Mark, Reconsidered." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, XX (1965), 131-47.

Rohde, Joachim. *Die redaktionsgeschichtliche Methode: Einführung und Sichtung des Forschungsstandes*. Hamburg: Furche, 1966.

Schmid, J. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. 4th ed. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1958.

Schmidt, Karl L. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur Ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*. Repr. ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.

Schoeps, Hans J. "Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde." *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Symbolae Biblicae Upsaliensis, No. 2. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1950. Pp. 126-43.

Schreiber, Johannes. "Die Christologie des Markusevangeliums." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, LVIII (1961), 154-83.

________. "Der Kreuzigungsbericht des Markusevangeliums: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Mk. xv.20b-41." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Friedrich-Wilhelm University, Bonn, 1960.

Schweizer, Eduard. "Anmerkungen zur Theologie des Markus." *Neotestamentica et Patristica*. *Freundesgabe für O. Cullmann*. Edited by W. C. van Unnik. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962. Pp. 35-46.

________. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Bd. 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1967.

________. "Mark's Contribution to the Quest of the Historical Jesus." *New Testament Studies*, X (1964), 421-32.

________. "Die Theologische Leistung des Markus." *Evangelische Theologie*, XXIV (1964), 337-55.

________. "Zur Frage des Messiasgeheimnis bei Markus." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, LVI (1965), 1-8.

Scobie, C. H. H. *John the Baptist*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

Scott, R. B. Y. "Behold He Cometh with Clouds," *New Testament Studies*, V (1959), 127-32.

Seitz, O. J. F. "Gospel Prologues: A Common Pattern?", *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXIII (1964), 262-68.

________. "*Praeparatio Evangelica* in the Markan Prologue." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXII (1963), 201-06.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, Bd. 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.

Strecker, Georg. "Die Leidens und Auferstehungsvoraussagen im Markusevangelium (Mk. 8,31; 9,31; 10,32-34)." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, LXIV (1967), 16-39.

________. "Zur Messiasgeheimnistheorie im Markusevangelium." *Studia Evangelica*, Vol. III. Edited by F. L. Cross. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, Bd. 88. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964. Pp. 87-104.

Taylor, Vincent. The Gospel According to St. Mark. 2d ed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1966.

Teeple, Howard M. The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, Vol. X. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957.

Tödt, H. E. The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. The New Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.

Turner, C. H. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: S. P. C. K., n.d.

________. "Text of Mark I." Journal of Theological Studies, XXVIII (1927), 150-58.

Vielhauer, Philipp. "Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums." Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1965. Pp. 199-214 (=Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag. Edited by Erich Dinkler. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1964. Pp. 155-69.).

Violet, B. Die Apokalypsen des Esra und des Baruch in deutscher Gestalt. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924.

Vögtle, A. "Messiasbekenntnis und Petrusverheissung." Biblische Zeitschrift, I (1957), 252-72; II (1958), 85-103.

Weeden, Theodore J. "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel." Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LIX (1968), 145-58.

Weiss, Bernard. Das Markusevangelium. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1872.

Weiss, J. Das älteste Evangelium. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903.

Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Marci. 2d ed. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1903.

Wendling, Emil. Die Entstehung des Marcus-Evangeliums. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1908.

Wikgren, A. "ARCHĒ TOU EUANGELIOU." Journal of Biblical Literature, LXI (1942), 11-29.

Winter, Paul. On the Trial of Jesus. Studia Judaica, Bd. 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1961.

Wrede, William. Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913.

Zahn, Th. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by M. W. Jacobus and others. 3 vols. in 1 vol. ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.